

The CLASSICAL QUARTERLY and CLASSICAL REVIEW are the organs of the Classical Association. The QUARTERLY is published in January, April, and October (double number); the REVIEW in February, May, July, September, November, and December.

The Classical Review

EDITORS { E. HARRISON, M.A., Trinity College, Cambridge.
C. J. FORDYCE, M.A., 3, The University, Glasgow, W. 2

All correspondence should be addressed to Mr. FORDYCE. Books for review should be sent to the Publisher.

Board of Management:

Prof. D. S. ROBERTSON, M.A. (Chairman), representing the Cambridge Philological Society.
J. G. BARRINGTON-WARD, M.A. (Hon. Treas.).
Prof. J. F. DOBSON, M.A. Representing the Council of the Classical Association.
Prof. H. A. ORMEROD, M.A., F.S.A.
F. H. SANDBACH, M.A.
Prof. E. H. WARMINGTON, M.A. E. A. BARBER, M.A. (Hon. Secretary), representing the Oxford Philological Society.

With the co-operation of Prof. TENNEY FRANK, Johns Hopkins University, Prof. E. E. RAND, Harvard University, and Prof. W. J. WOODHOUSE, University of Sydney.

Vol. L

DECEMBER, 1936

No. 6

CONTENTS

	PAGE
NOTES AND NEWS	209
TRANSLATION FROM SEMONIDES. J. M. EDMONDS	210
HESIOD, <i>Works and Days</i> , l. 740. E. C. YORKE	212
NOTES ON THE <i>Aniularia</i> . O. SKUTSCH	213
TWO PHRYGIAN EPITAPHS. W. M. CALDER	214
PLINY ON THE FIRST COINAGES AT ROME. J. G. MILNE	215
<i>Tantum auri vides</i> . F. A. TODD	217

REVIEWS:

The Homeric Hymns (Allen, Halliday, Sikes), T. A. SINCLAIR, 217; *Die Homer-Mimesis in den homerischen Hymnen* (Teske), H. J. ROSE, 219; *Een Keerpunt in Plato's Denken* (de Vogel), J. TATE, 220; *Essays in Ancient and Modern Philosophy* (Joseph), T. M. KNOX, 220; *Aristotle: Minor Works* (Hett), E. S. FORSTER, 221; *Hermetica*, vol. iv (Scott and Ferguson), H. J. ROSE, 222; *Plaute*, tome iv (Ernout), W. BEARE, 223; P.

REVIEWS (continued):

	PAGE
<i>Terenzio Afro: Hecyra</i> (Stella), J. D. CRAIG, 224; <i>The Odes of Quintus Horatius Flaccus translated</i> (van Gundy), E. S. FORSTER, 225; <i>P. Vergili Maronis Aeneidos liber quartus</i> (Pease), C. J. FORDYCE, 226; <i>Petronio</i> (Marmorale), S. GASELEE, 227; <i>The Invec-tive in Rufinum of Claudius Claudianus</i> (Levy), W. H. SEMPLE, 228; <i>A Short History of Greece</i> (Robinson), A. F. GILES, 229; <i>Histoire Grecque</i> , tome iii (Glotz and Cohen), M. CARV, 230; <i>Public Arbitration in Athenian Law</i> (Harrell), A. W. GOMME, 231; <i>Excavations at Thermi in Lesbos</i> (Lamb), D. B. HARDEN, 232; <i>Dedalia</i> (Jenkins), B. ASHMOLE, 233; <i>Class-books</i> , J. T. CHRISTIE, 235; <i>Catálogo de los Códices Griegos de la Biblioteca de el Escorial</i> (Revilla), J. E. POWELL	236
SHORT REVIEWS	237
SUMMARIES OF PERIODICALS	243
BOOKS RECEIVED	246
INDEXES	247

LONDON: JOHN MURRAY, ALBEMARLE STREET, W.
NEW YORK: G. E. STECHERT & CO., 31-33, EAST 10TH STREET.

Price of the present number, 3s. net. Yearly subscription, 12s. net, post free; U.S.A. \$3. Combined yearly subscription for the CLASSICAL QUARTERLY and the CLASSICAL REVIEW, 25s. net, post free; U.S.A. \$6.25.

THE CLASSICAL ASSOCIATION

THE objects of the Classical Association are to promote the development and maintain the well-being of classical studies, and in particular (a) to impress upon public opinion the claim of such studies to an eminent place in the national scheme of education; (b) to improve the practice of classical teaching; (c) to encourage investigation and call attention to new discoveries; (d) to create opportunities for intercourse among lovers of classical learning.

Membership of the Association is open to men and women alike. The annual subscription is 5s. (life composition, £3 15s.), and there is an entrance fee of 5s. (not charged to Libraries). Members receive a copy of the annual *Proceedings* of the Association and, on a payment of 2s. 6d., of *The Year's Work in Classical Studies* (both post free). They may also obtain the *Classical Review* and *Classical Quarterly* at reduced prices (*Review* 10s., *Quarterly* 13s.; combined subscription £1 1s.), though the reduction cannot be guaranteed unless the subscription is paid before January 31st in each year. *Greece and Rome* may be obtained for an annual subscription of 7s. 6d.

Applications for membership should be addressed to the Hon. Treasurer, Miss E. C. Gedge, Westfield College, London, N.W. 3. Inquiries should be sent to The Triangle Offices, 61, South Molton Street, W. 1, addressed either to the Hon. Secretaries of the Association (Professor T. B. L. Webster, The University, Manchester, and Miss N. C. Jolliffe, Girton College, Cambridge) or to the Hon. Secretary of any one of the District Branches—viz., Aberystwyth, Bedfordshire, Birmingham, Bristol, Cambridge, East Anglia, Cardiff, Hull, Kent, Leeds, Leicester, Liverpool, London, Manchester, Northumberland and Durham, North Wales, Nottingham, Oxford, Reading, Sheffield, Southampton, South-Western, Sussex, Swansea, Taunton and West Somerset.

The Loeb Classical Library

EDITED BY

†T. E. PAGE, C.H., LITT.D.

E. CAPPS, PH.D., LL.D.

W. H. D. ROUSE, LITT.D.

FOUNDED BY JAMES LOEB

Each volume, Foolscape 8vo, 400-700 pages. Clear type. Cloth, 10s. net. Leather, 12s. 6d. net.

A series of Greek and Latin Texts, with English Translations on the opposite page. The series is to contain all that is best in Greek and Latin Literature, from the time of Homer to the end of the Western Empire.

‘We shall never be independent of our Loeb.’—TIMES LIT. SUPP.

List of Books to be published, November, 1936, and February, 1937

Latin

- 312. *Tacitus. HISTORY AND ANNALS.* In three volumes. Vol. III. Translated by J. JACKSON.
- 304. *Celsus de Medicina.* In two volumes. Vol. II. Translated by W. G. SPENCER.
- 313. *Livy (Books 38-39).* In thirteen volumes. Vol. XI. Translated by EVAN T. SAGE.
- 314. *Remains of Old Latin.* In three volumes. Vol. II. (LIVIVS, NAEVIUS, PACUVIUS, and ACCIUS.) Translated by E. H. WARMINGTON.
- 315. *Ammianus Marcellinus.* In three volumes. Vol. II. Translated by J. C. ROLFE.

Greek

- 316. *Aristotle Problems, I-XXI.* Translated by W. S. HETT.
- 317. *Aristotle Problems, XXII-XXXVIII.* Translated by W. S. HETT.
- Rhetorica ad Alexandrum.* Translated by H. RACKHAM.
- 302. *Lucian.* In eight volumes. Vol. V. Translated by A. M. HARMON.
- 320. *Philo.* In nine volumes. Vol. VII. Translated by F. H. COLSON.
- 318. *Demosthenes (PRIVATE ORATIONS).* In three volumes. Vol. I. Translated by A. T. MURRAY.
- 321. *Plutarch Moralia.* In fourteen volumes. Vol. X. Translated by H. FOWLER.

Machines or Mind ? (an introduction to the Loeb Classical Library).

Free together with Descriptive Prospectus, &c.

WILLIAM HEINEMANN, LTD., Windmill Press, Kingswood, Tadworth, Surrey
HARVARD UNIVERSITY PRESS, Cambridge, Mass., U.S.A.

,
t
e
,
A.
-
S,
h
l,



The Classical Review

DECEMBER, 1936

NOTES AND NEWS

ON a later page of this journal, in a summary of recent numbers of the *Classical Weekly*, a transition and a bereavement may be read between the opening lines. Last summer, after many years of devoted service, Charles Knapp resigned his editorship; and in September he died. 'I dare say', writes Dr. E. Riess, 'that the *C.W.* printed not a single line which the editor had not read and pondered in the manuscript, for which he had not checked each individual reference and quotation. . . . In addition, he read personally the proof sheets.' Some editors that we know of do as much: but also 'he frequently added his own comment in the form of an appended note'. That is what struck us; and if at times such comments might seem intrusive, we envied an editor who could impress upon his contributors his own strong sense of precision and concinnity. He is hard to succeed, but Mr. Kraemer has started well, with a good new type, and with a declaration of policy which promises to fortify the position of the *C.W.* in international scholarship. Users of our classical libraries who do not know the *C.W.* must seek it out.

The Classical Association will meet at Westfield College, London, on January 8. The General Meeting will be held at the Queen's University, Belfast, on April 7-10.

The Classical Association of Scotland held its winter meeting this year at Aberdeen. The Annual Dinner took place on October 23rd. On the following day Sir George Macdonald, the President for 1936, delivered an address on 'The Classics in Scotland—A Retrospect.'

The Jubilee Exhibition of the British School at Athens at Burlington House had a very successful opening by

H.R.H. the Duke of Kent on October 13th; and has been very successful since, more than ten thousand persons having visited it by the middle of November. To one not closely acquainted with the School's activities, the most noticeable feature must have been their wide variety. The exhibits were shown in four rooms: in the first, those of the pre-classical period from Knossos—a very crowded room; in the second, more of the pre-classical period, from Phylakopi and Palaikastro, and the very important works of the classical—mostly archaic—period from Sparta; in the third, those from the recent excavations at Perachora and Ithaca, also chiefly archaic, together with objects from a great variety of other sites, including Thessaly, Macedonia, Lesbos, Cyprus, and Megalopolis; and in the fourth, Byzantine painting and architecture and more modern embroidery. The last had the advantage of appeal to a wider public—and it was for that public that the exhibition was primarily intended; but though, inevitably, much of the rest must have seemed obscure to all but specialists without explanation, that explanation was forthcoming later in lectures given by Sir Arthur Evans, Professor Wace, Professor Droop and others. For the ordinary scholar, the best single exhibit was Payne's triumphant restoration of the Rampin head and the fragmentary mounted figure in Athens: the head we had all known for a long time, it was illustrated in all books on Greek sculpture, but it had never been placed, even as a head. Now it is given not only its position in history, but significance; the whole figure is one of the most delightful pieces of archaic sculpture.

The Jubilee was celebrated beneath the dark shadow of the deaths of Humphry Payne and Alan Blakeway. Though both so young, they cannot be adequately described as men of brilliant

promise; for they had both achieved much, and what they achieved was mature and of the first quality. Yet of what great promise for the future has the world of scholarship been cheated!

The publication of the complete corpus of Roman inscriptions in Britain which was projected by Haverfield is now in sight, and a final search for material is being made. Anyone who knows of inscriptions in private possession or in out-of-the-way places which are likely to have escaped notice is invited to communicate with Mr. C. E. Stevens, Magdalen College, Oxford (for England south of a line from Gloucester to the

Wash), Mr. E. B. Birley, Chesterholm, Bardonia Mill, Northumberland (for the region north of that line), or Mr. V. E. Nash-Williams, National Museum of Wales, Cardiff (for Wales). Every inscription of Roman date is wanted except (a) legends on coins, (b) makers' names stamped on pottery, and (c) inscriptions brought from abroad in modern times.

Professor W. C. Summers has long been engaged in collecting materials for something like a complete Thesaurus of Livy; and a copious selection from them is to be published by the Cambridge University Press.

SEMONIDES OF AMORGOS AP. STOB. FLOR. 73. 61.*

HEIGH God departed whan the world bigan
The wit of womman fro the wit of man.

This wyf is of a bristelich Sowe yborë;
Hire houshold gere hit rouleth on the florë;
In dritte hit lith withouten pegge or shelvë;

5 Ydight in wede unwasshen as hirëselvë
She wexeth fat yset upon the mixenë.

This other made he of a wikkë Vixenë,
A wyf that wot al thing that be to don;
Foul dede or fayr she knoweth everichon;
10 Ill in hire mouthe ofte good is, good ofte ill,
And mode to mode alday she chaungen will.

This of a Bicché; she, lyk to hire moder
A bisi bodi algátës in a poder

To here al, knowe al, poureth everiwherë

15 And prieth, berkinge al no thing be therë;
Hire make ne moghte hir stinte for manace nonë
Thogh wroth he stroke hire teeth out with a stonë,
Ne yit for softë wordës never, albë
She sitte amidde straungë companie—

20 Hire ydel yolping she behalt alweië.
Another Goddës hond shop alle of Cleië;
Hire housbond hath a fool that wot no thing
Ne gode ne badde, ne can but oon, eting;
25 Albeit heigh heven hard winter sent, she noldë
The ner drawe stool to fyrë for the coldë.

This other of the See, of myndës tweië;
She laugheth and mak'th merinesse to daië;
If straunger come, he preiseth her, quoth he

30 'No wight may bettrë wyf ne fayrer se';
To morwe is she that man ne beren mightë
Ne for to aprochen ne to han in sightë:
Ne shaltou thilkë neighen in hire ragë

35 Namo than bicche with yonge, ne hire aswagë

* The text and line-numeration are that of *Elegy and Iambus* ii in the Loeb Library. I wish to acknowledge here the kind help of Miss H. M. R. Murray.

- That she ne frend ne fo ne mot annuyë ;
 As ofte the See in stillë calme doth lyë
 In somerës tide and maketh shipmen glad,
 40 Yit ofte with roringe wawës renneth mad,
 Of ilkë disposicioun is she,
 Ne hath natüre noon other than the See.
 Of stife unbuxome Asse he madë this ;
 45 Unnethës all she doth bigonnen is,
 For pleynë nede and eek for manie a thretë,
 Ne thanne but halfe ydo ; yit see hir etë
 Day in day out in kichene and in hallë !
 And to hire shetës wel come oon and allë.
 50 Another of a Catte, of woful kindë ;
 In thilkë nis no ioië for to findë,
 Ne ani thing of fayre ne swote ne godë,
 Albeit to winnen lemman ren'th she wodë,
 Yit lotheth him to embrace hir that hir taketh ;
 55 Moche harm bi stalthe hire neighëbores she maketh ;
 And offeringes bilaft hire ben good cherë.
 This of a slike and longë-manëd Merë ;
 All swinke and swote she evermo reneyeth,
 Ne willës hond to syve ne quernë leyeth,
 60 The mukke out attë dore she nil not rakë,
 Ne waccheth pot for fere the soote hir blakë ;
 Housbond she counteth dere but for to save hir ;
 Twiës bi daie and thriës wol she lave hir ;
 65 And ointeth hir with salvës ; thilk halt ay
 Wel kempt hire haire and eek with flourës gay.
 Swich wyf mak'th otherë men ful good seing,
 Yit evil were hire spousë that nere king
 70 Ne prince to pryden him on swicchë shapë.
 Another God him makëde of an Apë ;
 This is of alle his werste yiftës croun,
 So foul of face she maketh laughe the toun ;
 75 Slow, crokëd, shrunken-shankëd, lene of hippë,
 Wo worth the wight that swicchë meschief clippë !
 A maister thilk in apëlichë wilës,
 Ne yiv'th a bene of anie iapinge smiles ;
 80 Ne kindënesse doth noon, but al the day
 Bithenk'th hir how to done the werst she may.
 Another of a Bee ; right happi his namë
 That hath hir, ther aloon ne lighteth blamë ;
 85 She buddës yiv'th and blosmës to his lyf,
 And wexeth old a loved and loving wyf,
 The moder of children fayre of fayre renoun,
 Of allë wommen knowen up and down ;
 Hire oversprat a wonder grace ywis ;
 90 Ne hire to sitten ther no plésaunce is,
 Wher wommen talës telle of baudery.
 Swich ben the beste and moste discrete, say I,
 Of alle the wyvës God on men bistoweth ;
 Thise otherë that who hereth me wel knoweth
 (To Godde in hevenë be the thank for al)
 95 A meschief ben to manne and everë shal.

J. M. EDMONDS.

HESIOD, WORKS AND DAYS, I. 740.

μηδέ ποτ' ἀνάνων ποταμῶν καλλιρροον ὄδωρ
 ποσὶ περᾶν, πρὶν γ' εὖξῃ ἰδῶν ἐς καλὰ ῥέεθρα
 χεῖρας νιψάμενος πολυηράτωι ὕδατι λευκῷ.
 δὲ ποταμὸν διαβῆι κακοτήτιδε χεῖρας ἀνίπτος, (740)
 τῷ δὲ θεοὶ νεμεσῶσι καὶ ἄλγεα δῶκαν ὀπίσω.

THESE lines stand as they are printed by Wilamowitz,¹ who writes in his note *ad loc.*: '740 habe ich unabgeteilt gelassen was überliefert war und als κακότητ' ἰδὲ oder κακότητ' ἰδε oder κακότητι δὲ ebensowenig verständlich wird wie durch Konjektur κακότητ' ἐπὶ oder andere sprachwidrige Erklärung.'

In regard to the reading κακότητ' ἰδὲ χεῖρας ἀνίπτος, Sinclair² justly remarks *ad loc.* that 'the hendiadys is harsh and gives a ludicrous impression, and "unwashed of wickedness" savours of Orphism.'

Of κακότητ' ἰδε Schömann³ writes, 'Igitur versum sic scriptum

δὲ ποταμὸν διαβῆι κακότητ' ἰδε, χεῖρας ἀνίπτος

interpretati sunt in hunc modum: δὲ ποταμὸν διαβῆι, ἐκακώθη, χεῖρας ἀνίπτος sc. ὦν, h.e. χεῖρας μὴ ἀπονιψάμενος, cuius interpretationis veritatem equidem praestare nolo, sed placuisse eam nonnullis, et placituram hodieque uni aut alteri, certo scio.' But I much doubt if anyone has ever been whole-heartedly convinced by this.

As for κακότητι δὲ, we may quote Wilamowitz once more: 'Wenn man einen argen Stümper in dem Verfasser sehen darf, geht vielleicht κακότητι δὲ "wer einen Fluss durchwatet, aber durch seine κακότης ohne Waschung der Hände." Aber was da κακότης sein soll, was der Dativ will, ist dann durch das Ungeschick des Verfassers unverständlich.'

Aristarchus rejected l. 740 (and presumably 741 as well), for what reason is not known. But if he had before him our text, he was amply justified.

If the couplet (740-1) is genuine, it must, I think, conceal a radical error. I suggest that what Hesiod wrote (if he wrote these lines at all) was perhaps

δὲ ποταμὸν διαβῆι κακομήτ' ἰδὲ χεῖρας ἀνίπτος, κ.τ.λ.

How a copyist could mistake the collocation of letters κακομήτ for the familiar κακοτήτ needs no explanation. κακομήτῃ I take to be a form of κακομήτης. It is true that κακομήτῃ is not found elsewhere (although κακομήτης occurs), but we have βαθυμήτῃ in Pindar (*Nem.* III 53) and πολυμήτῃ in Oppian (*Hal.* 5, 6.), so that there is no reason to doubt the possibility of κακομήτῃ.

Forms like ἀκάκητα, εὐρύοπα, ἱππότα, κυανοχαῖτα etc. are familiar in Homer, where they recur as stock ceremonial epithets of gods and heroes; and from Homer subsequent poets (including Hesiod) took them over, often using them in the same fixed phrases. But there are some 'Aeolic nominatives,' in addition to βαθυμήτῃ and πολυμήτῃ quoted above, which are not borrowed from Homer, Hesiod's ἡχέτα (*W. and D.* 582) and Pindar's χρυσοχαῖτα (*Pyth.* II, 16), for example. Ancient grammarians declared that these masculine nominatives in ᾱ belonged to the Aeolic and the Boeotian dialect; and they may well be right. But in any event there would clearly be no cause for surprise in finding the adjective κακομήτῃ in Hesiod. The only doubt that rises in my mind is occasioned by the fact that these 'Aeolic nominatives' seem always to be accompanied by a noun which they qualify, βαθυμήτῃ Χείρων, ὁ χρυσοχαῖτα . . . Ἀπόλλων, ἡχέτα τέττιξ, πολυμήτῃ Προμηθεύς etc.

κακομήτης sometimes meant 'devising evil'; see Hesychius, who explains both κακομήτης and κακομήχανος by κακόβουλος, used apparently in its later sense, 'of evil design' (cf. schol. ad Eur. *Orest.* 1403). But just as κακόβουλος can also be the opposite of εὐβουλος and mean 'ill-advised' or 'imprudent' (Aristoph. *Equit.* 1055; Plat. *Sisyph.* 391D), so, I assume, κακομήτης can also mean 'devising badly' or 'imprudent'—the opposite of εὐμητής.

Hesiod's advice (737-9) is: 'Never walk across a river without first washing your hands in the water and offering up a prayer.' Then, to drive his point home, he adds: 'Whoever crosses

¹ *Hesiodos, Erga* (1928).

² *Hesiod, Works and Days* (1932).

³ *Opuscula Academica* III p. 64.

a river imprudently and without washing his hands, with him the gods are angry' etc. The imprudence consists in the omission to wash the hands, a piece of negligence which Hesiod would certainly have regarded as ill-advised rather than wicked.

To match the elision of an 'Aeolic nominative' in the emended line, one may cite *Iliad* II, 107,

αἰτάρ ὁ αὖτε Θέστυ' (α) Ἀγαμέμνωνι λείπε φορῆναι.

E. C. YORKE.

New College, Oxford.

NOTES ON THE AULULARIA OF PLAUTUS.

3 ff. (*Lar familiaris loquitur*) hanc domum iam multos annos est quom possideo et colo patri avoque iam huius qui nunc hic habet. patri auoque iam P, patriabo iam codd. Noni 318.

THE datives *patri avoque* may be explained by the allusion to a sort of colonate¹ and the hiatus got rid of by inserting another *que* (Aldus)². Yet, making these two suppositions, we still miss a verb or a substantive conveying the idea 'and I have done so already for (or I have been associated already with) the father, etc.' Pylades accordingly wrote *patri avoque amicus iam huius*. But the relations between the Lar and the owners of the house were more hostile than friendly because of their thrift, and FAMVLVS before IAMHVIVS would account still better for the loss. The *Lar familiaris* calling himself a *famulus* is a truly Plautine touch, prompted, however, quite possibly by a ἥρως οἰκουρὸς of the original.

175. di bene vortant. : : idem ego spero. : : quid me? numquid vis? : : vale.

The double question *quid me? numquid vis?* is queer and without parallel, and the mss. give *nunc* instead of *num*. Neither of the two hitches is very serious, but taken together they justify an attempt at emendation. No plausible explanation, so far as I can see, could be offered for a corruption of *num quid nunc me vis* (Mueller). The correct reading seems to be *num quid me nunc vis*. *num* was left out and added in the

margin along with *quid* to guide it to the right place, then *num*, read as *nunc*, was taken to be the guide, and consequently *quid* was inserted after *nunc*.

731. Euclio, in utter confusion and despair over the loss of his treasure, meets Lyconides, who has been listening to his laments and considering whether he should remain or run away :

EUC. quis homo hic loquitur? LYC. ego sum. EUC. Immo ego sum miser et misere perditus.

Editors, since Acidalius, transpose *miser* to after Lyconides' *ego sum*, which not only makes Euclio's answer rather odd (Seyffert therefore conjectured *immo ego sum et miser et perditus*), but also spoils the characterization of Lyconides given in this scene. Conscious of his fault, he was terrified when he heard Euclio approaching. But as soon as he faces the desperate old man, his attitude changes to one of confidence, as his *bono animo* is in the next line suffices to show. The tradition, therefore, is sound, and must be interpreted by the analogy of *Bacch.* 276 :

CH. quin tu audi. NI. immo ingenium avidi haud penoram hospitis.

Here Nicobulus, possessed by the idea of the *avidus hospes*, who, according to Chrysalus' report, attempted to cheat him out of his money, understands the imperative *audi* as a genitive of *avidus*, and thus, by his precipitate *immo*, means to interrupt a sentence quite different from that intended by his interlocutor.³ Exactly the same happens in *Aul.* 731. Lyconides answers the question 'Who's speaking here?' by 'It's me'. Euclio, however, preoccupied with his own *miseria*, and completely off his head, believes

¹ So A. Thierfelder (in a letter to the author), referring to Ulp. *Dig.* 47, 10, 5: *fundum . . . qui domino colebatur*.

² *-que . . . -que*, otherwise not used in Plautus in the senarius, would not be impossible in a prologue: see Fraenkel, *Plautinisches im Plautus*, p. 210; Haffter, *Untersuch. z. altlat. Dichtersprache*, p. 119. Yet here, as Mr. W. L. Lorimer kindly reminds me, the occurrence of *pater avoque* in v. 22 speaks rather against it.

³ See F. Skutsch, *Forschungen*, p. 44.

that Lyconides is going to say *ego sum miser*, and interrupts him accordingly. This sort of joke does not strike us as particularly funny. But in the case of *Ant.* 731 it must be borne in mind that this line opens the famous 'scene of

misunderstandings', and that a misunderstanding, though of another type than those that follow, is therefore not altogether out of place.

OTTO SKUTSCH.

St. Andrews.

TWO PHRYGIAN EPITAPHS.

THE following two inscriptions, no. 1 carved on the rock beside a rock-cut chamber near the Tomb of Midas, no. 2 inscribed on a slab found in the village below the Tomb, are published in *MAMA* I, nos. 390 and 389. The first has long been known and has been much discussed; the second was published by the writer in *Rev. de Phil.* XLVI, 1922, p. 114.

1. χαῖρε μάκαρ πολλ[ύ]θε θεῶν Ἵππερίωνε λάντων·
πάντων γὰρ φίλος ἐσθλός, πάτρης πρῶμος ἐνθάδε
νῆει·
πατρὶς ἐμὴ βέννευε καὶ λάνθανε πηλῆσια καρπούς.
2. κρήνηα φθενγόμεν[οι] χρησμηγόρου ἐξ ἀδότριοι·
ἐνθάδ' ἐμοὶ νήουσι γονεῖς ὑψώροφον ἐνδον
κειονά τ' ἀπὸν τε μνήμης χάριν οἶσιν ἔτευξα.

In my comment on no. 2 I quoted Ramsay's fruitful observation that these two poems were by the same versifier, but I failed to profit by this observation as fully as I can now do.

Both poems are epitaphs, the second obviously so (μνήμης χάριν), the first no less certainly, for both πάντων φίλος and ἐνθάδε ν(αί)ει belong to the sepulchral vocabulary of Phrygia. Both probably belong to the same third-century *συνγενικόν*.

No. 1 opens with an invocation to Apollon Helios. In publishing no. 2 I restored φθενγόμεν[οι] (the gap occurs at the end of the epigraphic line, and holds one or two letters), and on the assumption, which afterwards proved to be correct, that the inscription was complete, I connected φθενγόμενοι with γονεῖς and repaid Ramsay with a confirmation of his well-known theory that in Phrygia, and especially in this very region of Phrygia, the common man was deified at death, and had vows paid to him. With the restoration φθενγόμεν[οι] the inscription could only be explained as the advertisement of an oracular shrine, with the deified dead in the rôle of prophets.

This bold hypothesis was (privately) challenged by Professor Rose, whose suggestion φθενγομέν[ου] I mentioned in *MAMA* loc. cit. This reading, if correct, would indicate that the grave was prepared κατὰ χρησμόν (in such a context φθενγομένου for φθενξαμένου may pass). I know no example of a grave prepared κατὰ χρησμόν, but in the theocratic atmosphere of Phrygia such a possibility could not be excluded.

The clue to the correct reading has all along been under our eyes. The vocative in no. 1, πολύολβε Ἵππερίωνε (sic), imposes φθενγόμεν[ε] in no. 2. Apollon Helios is invoked in the first poem, Apollon Chresteros in the second. And the invocation in both cases is simply a poetic adaptation of Ἥλιε, (βλέπε), which Cumont has shown to have been one of the many formulae used to invoke the wrath of heaven on the violator of a tomb. The variant Ἥλιε Τειτάν, τὴν αὐτὴν χάριν ἀντάποδος (with a pair of upraised hands) and its Christian derivative +βλέπε+ both occur at a neighbouring village (*MAMA* I, nos. 399, 403).

In addition to the sanctions of the fine-formula and the criminal prosecution, which were characteristic of the cities, the Phrygians used a variety of *devotiones* for the protection of their graves. The commonest formula consisted of an imprecation, e.g.

τίς ἂν προσοίσει χεῖρα τὴν βαρόφθορον
οὕτως ἄρως περιπέσοιτο συμφοραῖς.

Sometimes the would-be violator was directly addressed, as in τὸν θεόν σοι· μὴ ἀδικήσης (or -σεις), a common form in northern Phrygia, used both by pagans and by Montanist Christians. Or the protecting god was appealed to either by formula, as in Ἥλιε, βλέπε, or symbolically, as by the pair of hands raised to call the god to witness (see *MAMA* I, no. 399, and Cumont quoted

there). Mr Cox, who has made an exhaustive survey of published and unpublished inscriptions from the region of Dorylaion and Nakoleia, informs me that graves in this area are never protected by the fine-formula and hardly ever by imprecation, and he makes the suggestion, which is convincing, that the well-known epitaphs of this area in which a sepulchral formula is combined with a dedication to the local god (on which Ramsay based his theory of the deification of the dead) are in reality tombstones with a local variety of the protective formula (e.g. Διοφάνης καὶ Διονύσιος Δαμάδος ἀδελφῶ Φιλίπῳ καὶ Δ[ι] Βροντῶντι εὐχὴν, to appear as no. 135 in *MAMA* V).

In view of these analogies, we need not hesitate to explain the invocation to Apollo on the two epitaphs from the Tomb of Midas in like manner.

In no. 1, l. 3, Professor A. Wilhelm would read πατρις ἐμή, ἔννευε. I venture to retain the reading which three epigraphists have seen on the stone (and anyone can see on the facsimile in *MAMA*), and to hope that further confirmation may one day follow the guess

that in the land of Ζεὺς Βεννεύς or Βέννιος, where Βεν(ν)ος and Βεννεύται have already appeared in inscriptions, the local Graeco-Phrygian patois knew a verb Βεννεύειν. The Greeks of Greece formed verbs like βαρκεύειν and εὐιάζειν from the titles of gods; and Phrygia has already produced hieratic verbs which never wandered beyond the temple where they were coined (τεκμορεύσας at Antioch, πηδίσας at Aphrodisias). The remainder of this line reminds us that Plato's rule forbidding the burial of the dead in fertile soil went unheeded in Phrygia, where epitaphs mention the gardens and parks around the grave. Translate 'come close up and help yourselves to the fruit.'¹

¹ See Wilhelm in *Sitzb. Preuss. Akad. Wiss.* xxvii, 1932, p. 108. With Wilhelm and Tod (*C.Q.* xxiii, 1929, p. 5) I agree, in view of the certainty that ΥΟΣ is οἶος, that Βεννεν in *J.H.S.* xli p. 25 must mean βαίνειν, and would add that the existence of a verb Βεννεύειν in the neighbourhood accounts for the unique spelling. I should interpret NINY (reading certain) at the end of the line not as [Ἄιδος], but rather as ν(ν)ν(ι).

W. M. CALDER.

University of Edinburgh.

PLINY ON THE FIRST COINAGES AT ROME.

THE account of the first coinages at Rome given by Pliny (*Nat. Hist.* xxxiii. 3), which is a starting-point for the student of Roman numismatics, has caused some trouble owing to the difficulty of making the text given in the majority of the MSS agree with the evidence of the coins. The reading of the crucial passage, according to Jan-Mayhoff, is

aureus nummus post annos LI percussus est quam argenteus ita, ut scripulum valeret sestertios vicienos, quod efficit in libram ratione sestertii, qui tunc erat, VDCCLX. postea placuit XXXX signari ex auri libris, paulatimque principes inminuere pondus, et novissime Nero ad XXXXV.

This differs materially from the reading of B, which is admittedly the best of the MSS of the *Natural History*: in particular, the figure VDCCLX has no manuscript authority at all, but is a bold conjecture of Mommsen's to provide something like a reasonable rela-

tion of gold and silver. The text of B in the first sentence is

denarius nummus post annos LI percussus est quam argenteus ita ut scripulum valeret sestertio viciens quod efficit in librali ratione sestertii qui tunc erant CCCC.

The key-word here is the first: if *denarius* is read instead of *aureus*, the whole purport of the passage is changed, from a discussion of the relative values of gold and silver to one of those of the new and old silver coinage.

The reading *denarius* has presumably been ignored by editors because it was assumed that *denarius nummus* was a tautology of *argenteus*: but this is certainly erroneous. The *argenteus* is that coin previously described by Pliny as the silver struck in A.U.C. 485, which must be the *quadrigatus*: this was not a *denarius nummus* in the strict legal sense, since the standard of values was the bronze *as*, and the number of *asses* for which the *quadrigatus* was accepted

varied: it was first rated at ten *asses*, but it was not stabilized, and in the following sentence Pliny says that in 218 B.C. it had risen to sixteen. The *denarius nummus* of Pliny should mean a coin definitely struck with the denomination of ten *asses*; and this must be the *denarius* with the head of Roma and the mark of value X. Mattingly and Robinson have shown that this type, which used to be regarded as the first Roman silver of 269/8, must be dated much later;¹ and, though the date they propose, of about 187, is clearly too late—for these coins were known as *bigati*, and Livy states that large numbers of *bigati* were brought back to Rome among the spoils of the Gallic campaign in 197 and those of the Spanish campaign in 195—their arguments are for the most part valid for an issue in 218/7.

The *quadrigatus*, in fact, was not a *nummus* at all, but a silver piece of no denomination, whose relation to the bronze *as* may be compared with that of the Tudor gold pound to the silver penny which is the basis of English sterling currency; and its value varied in terms of *asses*, just as that of the pound did in terms of pence: sovereigns, unites, broads, and guineas were successively struck as equivalents of twenty shillings sterling, and each in turn appreciated, till 1816, when the new sovereign was pinned to a legal value, at a weight of little more than half that of the Tudor sovereign. The change in England was analogous to that at Rome in 218 B.C., when the *quadrigatus* had appreciated to sixteen *asses*, and a new *denarius* was struck which was pinned as a *nummus*. In other words, in 218 the Romans tried to express a bronze standard in silver, as in 1816 England tried to express a silver standard in gold: the former endured after a fashion for seven centuries, the latter has lasted only just over one: both alike were artificial, and so faded and died.

With this identification of the *denarius nummus*, the account of Pliny falls into a more logical sequence than was supposed. The first silver issued at Rome

was the *quadrigatus*, which was accepted at an agreed rate in *asses*: the *as* depreciated in content of bronze, and in the crisis of the second Punic war the agreed rate had gone up from ten to sixteen *asses*. Then, to relieve the currency, a silver coin of fixed value was struck, with a metal content of a scruple to the *sestertius*—which, it should be noted, is the actual content of the coins with the head of Roma and marks of value—in 218/7. Gold only came into the system later, when the *denarius aureus* was struck; and the reference of Pliny to the action of the *principes* would suggest that he was thinking of the first gold of Rome as that struck by Julius Caesar just before the beginning of the principate: any earlier issues of gold at Rome can be classed as emergency issues.

It is not difficult to find an explanation of the corruption in the received text. A mediaeval editor may well have been under the impression, as later scholars certainly were, that the *denarius nummus* was the same as the *argenteus*, and have altered *denarius* to *aureus* on the assumption that an *aureus nummus* was the proper complement of an *argenteus*. This would be natural enough to a Carolingian, who was used to *aurei nummi*, and got his ideas of Rome through the traditions of the Byzantine Empire:² he would not realize that no *aureus nummus*, in the strict sense, was ever struck at Rome till the time of Anastasius. It is much more likely that this change should have been made than the converse one of *aureus* to *denarius*: it can hardly be imagined that an early mediaeval editor would deliberately make the latter alteration; and there is no probability that it would be due to the error of a scribe.³

² Bede's use of the words 'aureum illud numisma' in his account of the vision of Earcongota (*Hist. Eccl.* iii. 8) shows how a western scholar's ideas of coin-nomenclature could be influenced by Byzantine terms: the story, and Bede's treatment of it, are purely Northumbrian. Douce noted the significance of this passage in his *Remarks and Collections*.

³ In the apparatus criticus the first word in the passage of Pliny under consideration is said to be corrected in B from *aenarius* to *denarius*: but the facsimile given by Bahrfeldt (*Die römische Goldmünzenprägung*, p. 3) suggests

¹ H. Mattingly and E. S. G. Robinson: *The date of the Roman denarius*: London, 1933.

The other changes that occur in the common text would follow on this. As it was absurd to think of a gold coin weighing a scruple being worth a *sestertius*, an equation which seemed more reasonable was invented; and then the exchange values were modified till Mommsen tried to cut the knot by forsaking the MSS altogether. It is really unnecessary to tamper with the reading of B in this regard: the stabilization of 288 new *sestertii* as the currency equivalent of 400 old *sestertii* rated at four *asses* each does not, it is

that the alteration was made by the scribe at once: he wrote *a*, saw his error, and changed the letter to *d* with an upward stroke. The slip does not seem to have any significance beyond this.

true, quite fit the first issue of *denarii* at 72 to the pound, but it does suit the issue at 84 to the pound which was made shortly afterwards; and it is quite possible that the Roman authorities undervalued their silver in the first instance, and corrected the error at an early date. The revised standard was maintained steadily thereafter, so Pliny may have had it in his mind in stating his equation.

It appears, therefore, that the reading of B is preferable on numismatic grounds to the received text, and that the latter can be better explained as a corruption of the former than the converse.

J. G. MILNE.

Corpus Christi College, Oxford.

TANTVM AVRI VIDES.

(Fortunata) Trimalchionis topanta est. . . Ipse nescit quid habeat, adeo saplutus est; sed haec lupatria prouidet omnia, et ubi non putes. Est sicca, sobria, bonorum consiliorum: tantum auri uidet. Est tamen malae linguae. Petronius, 37. 4-7.

The phrase *tantum auri uidet* has troubled a long succession of scholars, from Scheffer in 1665 to Paratore in 1933. The views of the earlier editors of the *Cena*, including Burman (1709), who records them, all involve some tampering with the text. Buecheler expelled the words as intruders, suggesting, with less than his usual felicity, that *uidet* is a corruption of *dines* and that the phrase in its original form was a gloss on *adeo saplutus est*.

I believe that the text is sound and that the words have their literal meaning. The unnamed speaker, one of Trimalchio's humbler guests, impressed by nothing so much as the affluence of Trimalchio and his wife and fellow-freedmen, is giving a character-sketch of Fortunata. She is *Trimalchionis topanta*; she *prouidet omnia*; she is *sicca, sobria, bonorum consiliorum*; and of all these virtues, but especially of her *bona consilia*, the visible wealth

of Trimalchio and herself (*quae nummos modio metitur*) is the issue and the proof. *Tantum auri uidet*, he says: 'you see all this gold.' It is an expression like the same speaker's *uidet tot culcitras* a few lines below in 38. 5. The use of *uidet*, for the more obvious imperative *uide* (cp. Trimalchio's *uidete* in 40. 7), is a mannerism of the speaker, and itself therefore argues the soundness of the text: cp. 38. 5 (quoted above) and 38. 7 *uidet illum qui in imo imus recumbit*. All of Petronius' characters are closely observed and realistically portrayed, in their speech as in all else. Another of the same character's mannerisms is his *ad summam* in 37. 5, 37. 10 and 38. 2: thrice in about a dozen lines.

'Le Citoyen D*****' (Paris, 1803), Studer (quoted by Buecheler), Ernout and Paratore assign to the words some such sense as 'you see she's worth her weight in gold', neglecting the uncomplimentary things said about Fortunata in the context. If, in that sense, the words are Latin, they are at any rate not the sort of Latin that this simple soul would speak: for him *uidet* is to be used, literally, of physical vision, and *aurum*, literally, of the palpable metal.

F. A. TODD.

University of Sydney.

REVIEWS

THE HOMERIC HYMNS.

The Homeric Hymns, edited by T. W. ALLEN, W. R. HALLIDAY and E. E. SIKES. Pp. cxv + 471; frontispiece. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1936. Cloth, 25s. net.

IN 1904 Macmillan published that invaluable edition which we know and

prize as 'Allen and Sikes'. We welcome this second edition, which comes from the Clarendon Press. Mr. Sikes was unable to take part in the revision, but his name still appears on the title-page since much of what he contributed is still in the book. Mr. Allen has been

equally fortunate in his second collaborator, Dr. Halliday, whose contributions to the commentary are perhaps the most important part of the new edition. The appearance of the book has been entirely changed; this has not been an improvement, but the necessity of using the plates of the Oxford text of 1911 was bound to make a squat ugly volume with the extensive commentary and introduction.

The introduction follows the same lines as before. The number of MSS is given as thirty-one instead of twenty-eight, but the additions are not very important. The MS G was known to the previous edition but neglected for the same good reasons then as now. A Salamanca MS containing Hymn XXV is an addition, but it has not been collated. The papyrus that contains some twenty-eight lines of Hymn II was already collated for the 1911 text and produced nothing striking. Hence there are only a few insignificant changes in the next two chapters, which deal with the relations of the MSS. Chapter IV, headed 'Prosody', is new. It is a kind of appendix to the Apparatus Criticus, telling us how and where MSS differ in such matters as $\acute{o} \delta'$ and $\delta\delta'$, $\acute{\epsilon}\pi\epsilon\iota\delta\acute{\eta}$ and $\acute{\epsilon}\pi\epsilon\iota \delta\acute{\eta}$, $\acute{\alpha}\rho$ and $\acute{\alpha}\rho'$. Apparently as a result of these investigations the editors prefer $\chi\acute{\epsilon}\rho\sigma\omicron\nu \delta\acute{\epsilon}$ to $\chi\acute{\epsilon}\rho\sigma\omicron\nu\delta\epsilon$, $\acute{\alpha}\lambda\alpha \delta\acute{\epsilon}$ to $\acute{\alpha}\lambda\alpha\delta\epsilon$. Chapters V and VI, on the Homeric Hymns in Antiquity and on their nature, have been enlarged and improved, and emphasis is added here and there. The same is true of the chapter on Language (VII). There are a few minor changes in the figures for neglect and observance of the digamma, and the Hymn to Apollo is treated as a whole. Chapter VIII (wrongly headed IX) is an account of editions of the hymns; but we badly need and can nowhere find a list of works cited, with the abbreviations used. The student may well be puzzled by K.-G., P.-R., ARW, K.-B., and B.B., and by the mention of a scholar's name without saying which of his books is meant.

The commentary has been improved all round. Some notes have been expunged, some shortened and simplified (II 77, III 5, VII 8, 27), others

shortened but not simplified (III 325, 331), many improved or corrected (II 92, 94, III 11, IV 48, IV 55, and Addenda p. 448). Very many have been enlarged by the addition of valuable and interesting matter, especially in the sphere of religion. A few have not been corrected when they ought to have been. At II 217 the reference to Hes. *Theog.* should have been corrected to Theognis 1023. At XIX 3: ' $\acute{\alpha}\mu\upsilon\delta\iota\varsigma$: not in Homer'—so both editions and nothing further; what is meant must be that in Homer $\acute{\alpha}\mu\upsilon\delta\iota\varsigma$ is always either *simul* or *una*, never *una cum* like the Attic $\acute{\alpha}\mu\alpha$ with the dative as here. The point was worth making since this use of $\acute{\alpha}\mu\upsilon\delta\iota\varsigma$ is common in Alexandrian epic.

Since the former edition investigations at Eleusis have shed some light on the date of the Hymn to Demeter (II). The precinct was at first simply a *temenos*, and the mysteries were performed in the open air. Before the archonship of Solon, say late in the seventh century, a *telesterion* was built, the first of many. This change may have been due to the Athenian absorption of Eleusis, the date of which is however uncertain. Now in the hymn there is no mention of any *telesterion*. The archaeological evidence, therefore, so far as it goes, must be added to the more familiar *argumenta ex silentio* which have led to the conclusion that the hymn is earlier, perhaps much earlier, than 600 B.C., namely the non-mention of Iacchus and the Athens-Eleusis procession together with the absence of Athenian colouring generally. Whether the hymn is as early as the eighth century, when the first *temenos* was made, archaeology has not decided. The editors incline towards the latter half of the seventh.

Advances in the study of religious history have also contributed much to the understanding of this hymn. The view taken in the former edition—that Demeter was the ripe ear, Persephone the new blade—is now abandoned, together with much fanciful etymology of divine names (pp. 98-100). Demeter, whatever her etymology, was in all probability an Earth-goddess, specialized, so to speak, in earth's most

important product, grain. What then of the maid? There is nothing to differentiate her from Demeter, and cults of Kore without Demeter are rare. She is Demeter over again, but without her the myth is nothing. Her rape by Pluto is a perpetuation of all that Demeter stands for. And this perpetuation was the object of the cult. The introduction of the Mother-Daughter idea is not merely beautiful in itself but gives added religious significance. The relation of this myth to the hymn is much more fully treated than before.

In the old edition (p. 60) Thuc. III 104 was misquoted *ἐκ τοῦ προοιμίου* 'Ἀπόλλωνος for *ἐκ πρ. Ἀπ.*, and an argument was there based on the presence of *τοῦ* (p. 61). In the new edition (p. 186) the citation is corrected but the argument based on the mis-

quotation is still there unchanged (p. 187, l. 10). On p. 105, six lines from the foot, for 'Tierney, C.R.' read 'Tierney, C.Q.'

The unity of the Hymn to Apollo is now confidently maintained and well argued, and Cynaethus is named as the author. Space forbids a detailed discussion of this complicated problem. The alleged incompatibility of the Delian and Pythian parts is closely examined, and the conclusion is reached that 'all the operations ascribed by critics to unseen late hands may be safely given to Cynaethus'.

The possessor of the old edition cannot dispense with the new. It is abundantly clear that 'Allen-Halliday-Sikes' will now become the standard edition even as was 'Allen and Sikes'.

T. A. SINCLAIR.

Queen's University, Belfast.

HOMER IN THE HOMERIC HYMNS.

Aloys TESKE: *Die Homer-Mimesis in den homerischen Hymnen*. Pp. 73. Greifswald: Dallmeyer, 1936. Paper, RM. 2.

THIS is a good piece of criticism, forming No. 15 of the *Greifswalder Beiträge zur Literatur- und Stilforschung*; it has behind it the wholesome influence of Dornseiff, who, despite some extravagances, tries consistently to understand early Greek literature instead of dissecting it in accordance with modern ideas of which its authors had no inkling. Teske, starting from the often observed Homeric reminiscences in the hymns, is interested to prove that the poets of the greater compositions in our collection were no makers of patchwork, incapable of writing good verses themselves and so reduced to stealing Homer's. Rather is it true (pp. 69-70) that 'die Verfasser der Hymnen haben es schön gefunden, in ihren Gedichten den Lesern und Hörern Anklänge an bekannte und bereits berühmte Dichtung zu bringen', as every author in a classical tradition does. He postulates, what is highly likely, that the readers or audiences knew their Homer very well, and so could catch a slight allusion, a short phrase,

for instance, from some well-known episode, and appreciate it when it was introduced into a context somewhat similar. This is illustrated by analyses of the hymns to Apollo,¹ Aphrodite, and, more briefly, for they contain far less Homeric material, Hermes and Demeter. In most cases the parallels are well and ingeniously interpreted; e.g., *Apollo* 534 gains in point when we remember that the wording is taken from *λ* 146, where Teiresias is solving Odysseus' difficulty as Apollo in the hymn does that of the Cretans; there is neat malice in *Aphrodite* 163 with its echo of *Σ* 401, reminding us that the jewelry which Anchises strips off the goddess was wrought by poor Hephaistos. But sometimes the resemblances are fanciful, as when (p. 32) Teske would have us believe that the echoes of *A* 433 sqq. in *Apollo* 503 sqq. (one scene of disembarkation borrowing from another) were suggested by the resemblance in sound of the names *Χρύση* and *Κρίση*—at that date! Naturally, since completeness is

¹ Teske, following Dornseiff, thinks the Delian and Pythian hymns are one; I remain unconvinced.

aimed at, some resemblances are very obvious, as when the toilette of Aphrodite (*Aph.* 58 *sqq.*) draws upon θ 362 *sqq.* and Hera's toilette in Σ . But for the

most part soundness goes together with keen insight.

H. J. ROSE.

University of St. Andrews.

A TURNING-POINT IN PLATO.

C. J. DE VOGEL: *Een Keerpunt in Plato's Denken*. Pp. viii + 266. Amsterdam: H. J. Paris, 1936. Paper, fl. 4.25.

THE 'turning-point' is the *Parmenides* with its criticism of the theory of ideas advanced in earlier dialogues. It is argued that Plato now rejects the Parmenideanism involved in treating the ideas as separate and transcendent. Not-being is; negation is found to be a necessary element in the ideal realm. Therefore knowledge of the sensible world becomes possible; and human reason finds its proper domain no longer in contemplating the world of pure ideas—from which contemplation it is repulsed by the antinomies—but in the study of that relative being which now links *αἰσθητά* to *εἶδη*. Hence from the *Theaetetus* onwards Plato is increasingly disposed to observe and analyse the details of concrete reality. Such—if my brevity is not misleading—are de Vogel's views, based on a close and sober (though, of course, not exhaustive) study of possible interpretations. Where Plato does not help, his interpreters may be forgiven for failure; and it is no damning criticism to say that, like his predecessors, de Vogel does not state clearly and precisely in what way the Platonic philosophy is revolutionized. The 'lower dialectic' seen, for example, in the *Politicus*, is admittedly a later development than the 'higher' of *Rep.* VI and VII. But the ideas were always immanent as well as transcendent; transcendent as well as

immanent, in spite of difficulties, they remain. Seeds of the later logic are to be found even in the *Phaedo*. Hence, while there is certainly development, one may well hesitate to admit anything in the nature of a departure from earlier principles. Even if de Vogel's interpretation of the *Parmenides* were entirely true, no more than a change of spirit or of mood is to be inferred; and that is not the same thing as a change in belief. Indeed de Vogel rightly contends for 'continuity' and for 'evolution'. In insisting that the 'evolution' is also a 'revolution' he commits a pun or a paradox which at least one reader finds mystifying.

Does the ('early') theory of ideas belong to Socrates or to Plato? Almost half of the book is devoted to the Socratic question. By a patient treatment of the evidence de Vogel has little difficulty in showing, against Burnet and Taylor, that the theory is Plato's own; and that the identification of ideas and numbers is equally Plato's, but a later (and, one may add, a not so very fundamental) development. He is willing, however, to concede that (in spite of the *Apology*) Socrates was well up in physical theories, and that (in spite of Aristotle) Socrates (not Plato) may have been the first to call 'general notions' *ἰδέαι* or *εἶδη*. By these concessions he tends, in the reviewer's opinion, to blur the clearness of his case.

J. TATE.

University of St. Andrews.

ESSAYS IN ANCIENT AND MODERN PHILOSOPHY.

H. W. B. JOSEPH, M.A., F.B.A.: *Essays in Ancient and Modern Philosophy*. Pp. 340. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1935. Cloth, 15s.

Of the eleven essays in this book, three deal with the philosophy of Kant, one with the concept of evolution, one with

purposive action (with special reference to Aristotle's *Ethics*), one with Aristotle's definition of moral virtue, and the remaining five with Plato's *Republic*. Mr. Joseph's method is always both expository and critical; his work, it goes without saying, is in the highest

tradition of Oxford scholarship, and to students of both the *Republic* and the *Ethics* this volume is indispensable.

The first two essays deal with *Republic*, Book I, and there will be no gainsaying Mr. Joseph's view that Plato was not 'taken in by quibbles put into the mouth of Socrates that any freshman can detect' (p. 6), but that the conclusions drawn by Socrates are fairly reached, being in fact the reduction to absurdity of the false assumption that 'justice consists in the performance of specifiable acts' (*ibid.*). What Socrates is concerned to prove is not the correctness of his own view, but the falsity of the assumptions underlying the views of his interlocutors. It is surely only on this interpretation of the first book that it is possible to account for the sceptical remarks of Socrates at its close as he looks back over the course that the argument has taken. Of those remarks, however, Mr. Joseph makes no use, for he holds that in the argument with Thrasymachus Socrates is not simply attempting to refute him, but is putting forward and trying to substantiate teaching of his own. This involves Mr. Joseph in maintaining that *μισθαρνητικὴ τέχνη* is not simply a conception of which Socrates makes use in

an argument based on the assumptions of his adversary, but that it enshrines a positive doctrine of Socrates himself, the same doctrine, namely, which Aristotle expounds in the first book of the *Ethics* under the name of *ἀρχιτεκτονικὴ τέχνη*—'the art of conducting one's life as a whole' (p. 26). This, however, is more ingenious than convincing, for there is surely no evidence in the *Republic* that the 'art of gain' is a *controlling* art of life: the doctor and the architect, for instance, exercise the arts of medicine and architecture respectively *as well as*, not in subordination to, the art of gain (346c-d). In fact, Socrates introduces the *μισθαρνητικὴ τέχνη* not as something in which he believes himself, but as something which must be admitted by Thrasymachus or anyone else who maintains that ruling, for example, is an art operative in a specific and limited field; and he introduces it to disprove Thrasymachus' contention that the ruler in the strict sense considers, *qua* ruler, his own gain and not the interest of his subjects; that is, Socrates is not explicitly expounding his own thoughts, but using an *argumentum ad hominem*, and a good one at that.

T. M. KNOX.

University of St. Andrews.

THE LOEB TRANSLATION OF THE ARISTOTELIAN OPUSCULA.

Aristotle: *Minor Works*, with an English translation by W. S. HETT, M. A. Pp. viii + 516. London: Heinemann, 1936. Cloth, 10s. (leather, 12s. 6d.).

It is remarkable that the Aristotelian *Opuscula*, which had never been translated into English until 1913, should have been translated again so soon, this time in the Loeb Library.

The text used is Bekker's except for the *de lineis insecabilibus* and the *de Melisso*, *Xenophane*, *Gorgia*, where Apelt's Teubner text has been used. The translator would have been better advised if he had used the Teubner text throughout, perhaps substituting for Prantl's text of the *Physiognomonica* that of Förster in *Scriptores Physiognomonici*, Vol. i, which marks a great advance, and of which Mr Hett apparently makes no use. On the infrequent

occasions when Mr Hett deserts Bekker, Bekker's reading is given in a note, but no statement is made as to the authority, whether MS. or editor, for the change of reading.¹ His text is certainly unduly conservative, and he fails to use such work as has been done by previous editors. He not infrequently prefers to translate an unsatisfactory text, where a simple change would greatly improve the meaning: e.g., to take only two instances, in *de col.* 791^a 14 τὸ [μὴ]

¹ E.g. in *de aud.* 801^b 33 ζενύων for δυνέων is adopted without acknowledgment from the Oxford translation. Mr Hett also sometimes translates the text adopted in the Oxford translation while retaining Bekker's reading: a good example of this occurs in *Mech.* 853^b 12, where he reads ἀπὸ τῆς αὐτῆς τροχίλειας εἰς ἑτέραν but translates 'from one pulley to another', the reading adopted in the Oxford translation being ἀπὸ τῆς ἑτέρας τροχίλειας.

ὁρώμενον should certainly be read from the *versio Latina*, and in *Physiogn.* 811^b 32 εὐαίσθηται for ἀναίσθηται.

The text of the *de plantis* which Mr Hett uses is the late Byzantine version given in Bekker. This is a translation of a Latin version, which was a translation from an Arabic version of the original Greek. He would have done better to translate the Latin version, which is one stage nearer to the original and has been admirably edited by E. H. F. Meyer. Many passages might be quoted where the Latin gives a better sense. For example, in 821^b 7 the Greek version reads ἐν τῇ Πώμῃ (on which Mr Hett notes, 'The Greek here is certainly wrong'); the Latin version reads *in Coruma*, which represents the Arabic Qirm, 'the Crimea'.

Mr Hett would have increased the value of his work if he had supplied more references, especially to other parts of the Aristotelian corpus, and more explanatory notes. For instance, the *de lineis insecabilibus* is largely

unintelligible without more frequent explanations and figures such as are supplied by Professor Joachim in the Oxford translation. A chart of the winds should also have been given to illustrate the *Ventorum situs et cognomina*. Bibliographies too of the chief editions of the various treatises might well have been supplied; such a book as J. P. van Cappelle's admirable edition of the *Mechanica* certainly deserves the tribute of a mention.

Mr Hett's translation appears to be competent, though sometimes rather inelegant (for example in *de aud.* 803^b 26 he renders, 'The sounds falling on the ear will correspond to the sources of motion which the blows on the air have'), and sometimes inaccurate (for example, κοῖα 'lye' *de col.* 791^a 8 is rendered 'sand', and *ib.* 794^a 22 'dust', and κίναιδος *Physiogn.* 810^a 33 is wrongly translated 'morbid').

The *Index Rerum* is somewhat scanty.

EDWARD S. FORSTER.

University of Sheffield.

ΣΤΗΝ ΔΕ ΔΤ' ΕΡΧΟΜΕΝΟ . . .

W. SCOTT and A. S. FERGUSON: *Hermetica: the ancient Greek and Latin writings which contain religious or philosophical teachings ascribed to Hermes Trismegistus*. Vol. IV: Testimonia. Pp. xlix+576. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1936. Cloth, 30s.

AT length, after twelve years, the immense edition of the Hermetic writings planned and for the most part completed by the late Walter Scott has been given to the public entire. The present reviewer having already expressed his opinion of the text and notes,¹ it needs only to say that the former is marred by wildness of conjecture, the latter, while very full in the important matters of exposition and illustration, are sadly deficient in the linguistic exposition needed for such late and peculiar documents. This volume sets out to gather from all sources, pagan and Christian, in the classical tongues and also from a selection of post-classical writers, Greek, Arabic and Jewish, all that the editor

could find which would throw light on Hermetism. The extracts are printed in critical texts, or as nearly critical as were available, those whose language was not Greek or Latin being represented by translations. The rage for emending is less devastating here, though a number of conjectures are given, some few of them good or plausible, others totally unconvincing. Indeed, even the sober and cautious Professor Ferguson has been a little infected with this itch, and here and there puts forward guesses of his own which were needless, as on p. xxxiii, note 5.² But for the most part his

² In the *Κόρη Κόσμου*, p. 468, 27 Scott (= Vol. i, p. 392, 3 of Wachsmuth's edition of Stobaios) the traditional text says that the souls, when they took over the creative work of God, τὸ τοῦ πατρὸς προσεκύουν κράμα. Professor Ferguson would read, for προσεκύουν, ἐκύων, supposing a dittography of πρὸς (= πατρός). This is ingenious, but why, for the sake of what he describes as alchemical language, sacrifice the gesture of veneration, which is quite in keeping and makes good sense?

¹ See *C.R.*, XXXIX, pp. 133-5; XL, pp. 204-5.

contribution is of high value. It consists, firstly, in an introduction of nearly fifty pages, in which he deals with the analysis of some of the documents. Perhaps his most interesting conclusion is that the Greek original of the *Asclepius*, with its forebodings of the ruin of Egyptian religion, need be put no later than the Jewish troubles of Hadrian's time (p. x sqq.). But besides this, he has assembled a great mass of addenda (pp. 353-500), consisting of information concerning the text of the *Hermetica*, references to literature overlooked by or not available to Scott, and notes on difficulties of all sorts. Finally, he has added three noble indexes, *Graecitatis*, *Latinitatis* and *Locorum*, and ends with some further readings suggested by various scholars and a list of errata; the printing, by the way, is less faultless than one has learned to expect from the Clarendon Press, though most of the errors are very small, such matters as dropped accents and an occasional misdivided word accounting for the greatest number.

Scott's own share of the volume is pp. 1-352, the *testimonia* proper. They are taken from Christian sources in large part, Augustine and Cyril of Alexandria being the bulkiest; the Muslim and Jewish authors, with comments on them, occupy some 200 pages.

These are in some ways the most interesting, for the rest are generally available to anyone having access to Migne and other familiar works; they testify at least to the continuance of interest in Hermetism and related doctrines long after the end of paganism. A little alchemy is introduced in the form of an extract from Zosimos of Panopolis, in whose case, since the standard text is the very corrupt one in Berthelot's *Alchimistes grecs*, no one can blame the editor for emending freely. Of the long and elaborate notes and comments one stands out by its quaintness; Scott was of opinion that the document usually known as *Iamblici de mysteriis* was in very truth written by the Egyptian priest Abammon from whom it purports to come.¹

Altogether, if we have Scott to thank for accumulating a huge mass of learning for the use of future editors and elucidators of such difficult texts, much gratitude is due to Professor Ferguson for making some of the work available and the whole of it far more usable than it was when it came into his hands.

H. J. ROSE.

University of St. Andrews.

¹ See pp. 40-2; Ferguson, p. xlii and note 1 there, is clearly unconvinced, as indeed any careful reader of the text must be.

THE BUDÉ PLAUTUS, VOLUME IV.

A. ERNOUT: *Plaute, Tome IV: Menaechmi-Mercator-Miles Gloriosus*. Pp. 280. Paris: 'Les Belles Lettres', 1936. Paper, 30 fr.

THIS volume of the Budé Plautus repeats the virtues and limitations of its predecessors:—a sound text, somewhat lacking in enterprise; a full apparatus; interesting but all too short introductions to each play; a translation which is always elegant and scholarly but seldom tries to throw light on difficult passages; some notes on the subject-matter, necessarily meagre; finally a *conspectus metrorum*.

'S'il n'y avait que des gens raisonnables, et si la comédie devait uniquement s'inspirer du réel et du vraisem-

blable, il n'y aurait pas de comédie.' This remark, which would cut the ground from under much 'higher criticism', may be quoted (from the introduction to the *Menaechmi*) to illustrate the general character of the introductions and explanatory notes. As for the translation, we feel again and again that we are being given an approximation to the meaning but that too much has been sacrificed for the sake of smoothness.

Whatever may be the meaning of *Men.* 10,

ego nusquam dicam, nisi ubi factum dicitur,

nusquam must mean 'nowhere', not 'never'. We look in vain for fresh light on *Men.* 590 ff. The effective

repetition of hiatus in the tearful utterances of the Matrona (719 ff.) is rightly retained in the text; see Lindsay's note; there is no hint of it in the translation, however.

The introduction to the *Mercator* supports the view of Enk and others that here we have one of the earliest plays of Plautus, dating from a period when 'il n'était pas encore assez sûr de lui-même pour s'évader de son modèle', with the corollary that the much-discussed dream-scene must be ascribed to the Greek original. Is 'nous avons déjà mangé' an adequate rendering of the extremely amusing 'iam saturi sumus' of *Merc.* 750? Lysimachus has indeed lost his appetite, but not through having 'already dined'. In 790 of the

text *uerbeis* has been omitted. The objection made to *orato* in 908—'la plaisanterie de Charinus ne semble pas convenir ni à la situation, ni à son caractère'—however true in itself, is not, we fear, decisive against MS. authority and the essentially Plautine quality of the *παρὰ προσδοκίαν*.

Professor Ernout agrees that the *Miles Gloriosus*, like the *Mercator*, shows its early date in the simplicity of its metrical system. He does not believe that the play is the result of *contaminatio*.

Two misprints in the notes on page 179 may be mentioned:—the omission of *illud* in the last line of note 2, and *trois* for *deux* in the second line of note 3.

W. BEARE.

University of Bristol.

HECYRA.

Salvatore STELLA: *Hecyra*, Introduzione e Commento. Pp. 198. Milan: Carlo Signorelli, 1936. Paper, L. 7. *HECYRA* is the most interesting and in some ways the best of Terence's plays. More than any other it makes us realize an aspect of the New Comedy which is not always appreciated. One concealed fact involves two families in a painful, even distressing, tangle of misunderstandings. The 'comedy' consists chiefly in the actions of human beings working in ignorance and guided by prejudice. There is no laughter: only when the unhappiness is relieved by a lucky discovery a certain playfulness emerges towards the end. The story is not easy to follow; indeed it is not surprising that a Roman audience (without programmes) could make little or nothing of it on the stage.

Now an annotated edition which is to be helpful must elucidate the story. A brief summary is useless and the evasions of school-books merely confound. The present edition, in its introduction and throughout the commentary, is in this respect admirable. No detail of character or motive or situation is neglected. The editor brings real insight to his task.

In matters of idiom and syntax the notes are reliable and adequate. In other respects the commentary is clear and full, though its fullness might sometimes be termed otiose, as when the expression *pugilum gloria* (l. 33) occasions a description of Roman boxers which ends: 'il combattimento si svolgeva in parecchie riprese, e finiva allorché uno degli avversari non era più in grado di lottare o si dichiarava vinto'.

The text is an eclectic affair. Fleckeisen and Umpfenbach are generally preferred to the Oxford Text. No new reading is suggested.

As regards metre, there is certainly a *conspectus metrorum* at the end, but of discussion of individual lines throughout the commentary never a word. This is unkind. One or two lines (e.g. 343) will not scan at all.

But 'the play's the thing', and such defects as there may be in the book are amply compensated by the generous measure of good interpretation it contains. The editor has done Terence and Terence-readers a service.

J. D. CRAIG.

University of Sheffield.

A NEW VERSION OF HORACE'S ODES.

Justin Loomis VAN GUNDY: *The Odes of Quintus Horatius Flaccus translated into English Verse in Horatian Metres*. Pp. xiv + 172. The Department of Classics, Monmouth College, Monmouth, Ill., U.S.A., 1936. Cloth, \$1.25 postpaid.

OF the countless translations of Horace's *Odes* into English, the one before us must surely be among the least successful.

Professor van Gundy states that his objects are to give a simple interpretation of the thought and spirit of the original poems, and to make a metrical translation in the same verse-forms as Horace himself used. Unfortunately he achieves neither of these objects.

Rhythm in Latin poetry is founded on quantity, in English poetry on stress. Professor van Gundy admits this, but assumes that 'the accented and unaccented syllables of English words are, for metrical purposes, as truly quantitative, in a temporal sense, as those of the classical languages.' Even if we grant this, it is almost always difficult to fit his lines into the metre which they attempt to reproduce. For example, such lines as 'Till lately I lived quite worthy of virtuous maids' (*uixi puellis nuper idoneus*) and 'Rhode the debutante is in love with you' (*tempestiua petit Rhode*) reproduce neither the metre nor the meaning of the original.

Let us take an example quite at random, the version of II, i, 1-6:

So you are writing, Pollio, a history of
The civil strife; its causes, its errors and
The operations of the game of
War; and of Fortune's exchanges, and the
Momentous friendships of the commanders,
and
Of arms all stained with gore, not yet
expiate.

This is simply prose cut up into lengths, and is absolutely devoid of poetry and inadequate as a translation (e.g. it entirely omits *ex Metello consule*).

We may note the predilection which our translator shows for weak endings, which are conspicuously absent from the original. He sometimes goes further and ends a line in the middle of a word: for example (II, ii, 5-6),

Proculeius, known for his father-like affection towards his brothers, will live for ever.

This practice is quite unknown to Horace. (We may note in passing that 'brothers' has to be scanned as a single short syllable, like the *Brewer* Rabbit of Uncle Remus.)

One would like to quote a single stanza which adequately reproduces the metre and poetry of the original, but such a thing is simply not to be found. On the other hand almost every page contains some strikingly unhappy rendering: for example, 'Glyceria's beauteous sanctum' (*Glyceriae decoram . . . aedem*); 'the taciturn nun' (*tacita uirgine*); 'stay on your couches and don't act rudely' (*cupito remanete presso*); 'she seeks the younger set of fellows' (*iuniores quaerit adulteros*).

Our translator is sometimes rather scared by Horace's outspokenness and takes refuge in euphemistic language; e.g. *lasciua licentia* becomes 'happy and wanton intimacy,' and

*Telephum, quem tu petis, occupauit
non tuae sortis iuuenem puella
diues et lasciuia* (IV, xi, 21-23)

becomes:

Telephus, for whom you are setting your
cap, is a
Youth above your station, and he's engaged
to a
Lady rich and winsome.

Professor van Gundy expresses a hope that his version may be accounted 'a memorial worthy of the second millennial anniversary of the poet's birth'; we fear that his hope is scarcely justified.

EDWARD S. FORSTER.

University of Sheffield.

INFELIX DIDO.

P. Vergili Maronis Aeneidos liber quartus.

Edited by Arthur Stanley PEASE.

Pp. ix+568. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press (London: Milford), 1935. Cloth, \$6 or 25s.

IN these days when *Wissenschaft* runs riot we have resigned ourselves to the use of literature as a peg for learning, but the most hardened philomath will perhaps regret that the story which made Augustine weep and has moved the world ever since should in this ponderous volume have become the occasion for learned divagations on the habits of ants and the manufacture of purple, on ancient blondes and tigers and tattooing. Mr. Pease describes his edition as 'primarily interpretative' and speaks of assembling exegesis. But the sole duty of the interpreter is to enable us to understand what his author says and means; if he fails to do this, nothing else that he does can atone for the default. Mr. Pease's commentary is profuse, but it is rarely exegesis. When Virgil writes *odora canum vis*, the reader wishes to be told what is the force of the periphrasis (if such it is) and why Virgil used it; but no intelligent reader will wish to have a list of ancient authorities for ascribing keen scent to hounds. When we read the line *ille habeat secum servetque sepulcro*, it does not assist our appreciation of it or its author to be given a citation of Origen's views on the remarriage of bishops. In defence of his method Mr. Pease uses the plea that Virgil, as Servius said, is *scientia plenus*; what he has shown is rather that Virgil is full of opportunities for the display of an editor's erudition. On *Realien* of every kind he has amassed vast stores of information which sometimes has little value in itself and often has no bearing on the words of his author. Even when it is relevant, it is merely thrown at the reader without a hint of how it is to be used.

When Mr. Pease leaves the field of *Realien* for that of thought and expression, he shows the same misconception of the interpreter's task. The notes on the first two lines occupy the greater part of five pages; *caeco* is

'illustrated' by sixteen quotations ranging from Catullus to Racine, while *igni* calls forth a note on the association of fire with passion followed by twenty-two quotations and more than forty references. If anyone wants a full list of places where *spumans* is a 'stock epithet for wild boars', it is to be found on l. 158; but it is difficult to see why anyone should want either that or the list (l. 673) of over a hundred passages which mention beating the breast. The echoes of Virgil in later poetry are of interest for the study of the Virgilian tradition, but they rarely throw light on Virgil and their place is not in a commentary. Mr. Pease has collected scores of reminiscences from Carolingian and Renaissance versifiers (even colourless tags like *credo equidem* and *fatebor enim*) and recorded them with dreary fidelity; one breathes a sigh of relief to find that he has overlooked the resurrection of l. 67 in *Hist. Apollonii* 18. Many of his shorter notes, though less tedious, are equally unnecessary, and so are many of the exact references to modern works (he gives dates of publication even in citing volumes of the *Thesaurus*) with which he cumbers his space. What is the use of saying on l. 5 'Homer often alludes to wakefulness or troubled sleep', or on l. 288 '*fortem*: "stout"; a not infrequent adjective (e.g. I, 222; I, 510; I, 612)', or on l. 151 '*altos montes*: commonly coupled' (followed by twenty references)? Notes like (74) '*moenia*: for *urbs*; cf. 2, 234; Braunmüller, *op. cit.*, I (1877), 19' or (68) '*tota [urbe]*: for similar hyperbole cf. Hunziker, *Die Figur d. Hyperbel in den Gedichten Vergils* (1896), 58', are futile; for even the reader who has access to these works will suspect that he has little to gain by consulting them. The climax is reached in the note on l. 700 (*Iris roscida*): 'on the connection of the rainbow with dampness cf. Mayer, *op. cit.*, 2, 321-322'.

A master of words like Virgil needs an interpreter who is sensitive to language and alive to the finesses of style. In *Sprachgefühl* Mr. Pease falls short of less learned commentators,

and when he deals with language, his handling of it is sometimes strangely unscholarly. In l. 35 *mariti* no doubt means 'intending husbands', but that is not to say that there is an 'ellipse of the future participle of *esse*'. On l. 46 (*hunc cursum tenuisse*) he quotes, apparently with approval, Bell's opinion that '*hunc* here=*huc hunc*'. On l. 19 he writes '*potui*: for the word cf. Kühner-Stegmann, *Ausf. Gram. d. lat. Sprache*, 2, 2, 2 ed. (1914), 402'. Why 'the word'? As the reference to K.-S. shows, he means 'the use of the indicative'; that is not, indeed, a rarity, but if he wished to comment on it, he ought to have said so. On l. 26, not content with quoting Lucian and Ronsard, he cites Kvíčala as comparing Aesch. *P.V.* 1029; if Kvíčala did not see that 'deep dark' and 'dark deep' are not the same thing, Mr. Pease should have seen it. The note on l. 183 (*subrigit*), 'the verb is infrequent in a transitive sense, and after the Augustan age chiefly in the uncontracted forms', is a slovenly piece of writing; on l. 509 (*stant*) 'cf. ἵστημι as the passive of τίθημι' is worse. On l. 184 he has two notes; in the first he cites passages which clearly show (though he does not say so) that *caeli medio terraeque* are to be taken together; in the second he quotes without comment Servius's perverse interpretation, which takes the words otherwise. Whether Mr. Pease has understood the line is left to our conjecture. As for his omissions, two examples may suffice. On l. 412 (*improbe Amor*) he quotes Servius's note '*exclamatio a poeta contra amorem*' (which was not worth quoting), but says not a word about the meaning of *improbus* or Virgil's use of it. On 678 he says (in effect) that *vocasses* may be either potential or

optative; it has not occurred to him that it may very well be jussive.

What may make the reader most impatient with Mr. Pease is his unwillingness to rely on his own judgment and his habit of screening himself behind names which have no more weight than his own. In l. 19 he takes *huic uni* with *culpa*; he is probably right and he need not have cited Martinelli for his opinion, and Masera, Pistelli, Arnaldi and Buscaroli against it. This failing is most obvious in his Introduction, where in 71 pages he prints 546 footnotes; they could have been reduced by half without loss. Giving three authorities in support of the statement that Anna 'makes an admirable foil to Dido' is merely wasting space. The account of the sources of the book and its *Fortleben* gives a complete and useful summary of facts and theories; for the rest, the structure and the characters, we should have preferred the independent views of one who has studied the book for a dozen years to a record of what all sorts of critics, competent and incompetent, have said about it.

There is no denying that Mr. Pease has collected much interesting and valuable material. The pity is that he has poured it out in a flood and has never paused to digest it, to control it, and to use his mind upon it. His material has overmastered him and obscured the purpose for which it was gathered, the interpretation of a literary masterpiece. If he had lost his card-indexes, forgotten much that was not worth remembering, and thought out the text for himself, he might have done Virgil better service.

C. J. FORDYCE.

University of Glasgow.

AN ESSAY ON PETRONIUS.

ENZO V. MARMORALE: *Petronio*. Pp. 120. Naples: Ricciardi, 1936. Paper, L. 8.

IF Italian scholarship on the subject of Petronius was rather over-weighted by Paratore's book (*C.R.* XLIX, 85), in which indeed there were some elements of value, though they were so hard to

find, pleasant amends are made by Marmorale's acute little study. He is neither pedant nor moralist, and I mean to praise his work when I compare it with Charles Whibley's chapter on Petronius in *Studies in Frankness*. After a general introduction, he pursues his enquiry in a couple of chapters entitled 'Rhetoric

and Art' and 'Morals and Religion', and concludes with an excellent study which he calls 'Il riso pessimistico'. I think I shall give the truest impression of the manner in which he works, and the conclusions to which he has been led, if I translate his final passage:—

'So ends our investigation. We have examined the work of Petronius with scrupulous care. The situations we have discussed, the characters whom we have followed in their *péripéties* have not led us astray: we have been able to shew that Petronius is not a vulgar retailer of pornographic adventures, with no other object than to divert and please, as Macrobius wrongly believed, and many writers on the works of Petronius after him; that Petronius is not a man with too much wit and too little heart; that it is false that he makes nothing, or affects to make nothing, of the miseries of the life of the poor and humble which he here presents to us; that it is false that he is an agreeable story-teller, whose object is to present life as it is without any preoccupations or presages of morality; and finally that it is more than doubtful if his intention was to please us, and please himself, by a description of picaresque adventures, jostling among provincial characters.

Petronius is something more and better than this: he is a man who thinks, observes, and even suffers, who would see the world different from what it was, and does not resign himself to tolerate it as it is, without magisterially chastising it, as only an aristocrat of taste could do; who can climb up from a sewer without dirtying his shoes. Is it his fault, if he is bound to tell his story with a pessimism that is private to himself, but none the less remarkable? Is it his fault if his soul revolted against the filth that beflecked the life of his contemporaries? A critic of much taste [Émile Thomas], whom we have often quoted, found it necessary to say that in the novel of Petronius are the worst sides of the writer's times; virtue, nobility, devotion find no place here. This may be true: but how much virtue, how much nobility, how much devotion did Tacitus find to describe in the age of Nero, the age in which Petronius lived and died?

Some of this goes perhaps a trifle too far on the serious side: but Marmorale has produced a good little critical essay, which I can heartily commend to those who care for this author, whose work is unique in classical antiquity.

STEPHEN GASELEE.

CLAUDIAN IN RUFINUM.

The *Invective In Rufinum* of Claudius Claudianus. Edited with Introduction and Textual Commentary by Harry L. LEVY. Pp. 102. Geneva (New York): The W. F. Humphrey Press, 1935. Paper, \$1.75.

MR. LEVY deals with the historical and philological aspects of the *In Rufinum*. His introduction has three sections, the first a full presentation of the political situation out of which Claudian's invective grew, the second a brief account of Claudian's life and works, the third a critical examination of the ms. sources and a statement of the principles on which his text is formed. Then follows the text of the poem with an *apparatus criticus* recording the differences and agreements of Jeep, Birt, and Koch, whose major errors of judgment Mr. Levy discusses with admirable acumen in his critical notes.

The historical chapter gives an exact account of the career of Rufinus and of Stilicho, particularly in the period between the death of Theodosius and the fall of Rufinus. The author states that he has tried 'to take into consideration all the ancient sources which throw light on the period . . . and to assign the proper values to the discussions of the period by modern scholars which seem to merit attention.' This claim is made good by a study which, within the limits of twenty-five pages, is a comprehensive and methodical review of the situation both in Italy and in the East at the time when Claudian was writing his partisan apology for Stilicho.

The chapter on the textual tradition describes the available mss. and excerpts; discusses the relative value assigned to these sources by the three

most recent editors, Jeep, Birt, and Koch; and then lays down this sound critical principle: 'The extant mss. of Claudian . . . have all suffered greatly from contamination and interpolation. With a tradition of this sort, the establishment of a text by reference to the authority of a ms. or a group of mss. seems to me a wholly unwarranted procedure. However excellent a given ms. of Claudian may be as a whole, it is not homogeneous: the excellence of the majority of its readings is therefore no assurance of the correctness of any one reading.' Mr. Levy, therefore, withholds his allegiance and proceeds *per electionem*, basing his choice of each reading on three criteria which in order of importance are these: (1) the suitability of the reading with reference to the context and generally to the spirit and purpose of the poem; (2) the language and style of Claudian, and (where his usage is not determinable) the practice of the poets whom he imitates, Virgil, Ovid, Lucan, Silius, Statius; (3) the palaeographical possibilities, especially where emendation is admitted.

What of the text thus formed? In the 950 lines of the poem Mr. Levy in twenty-three instances differs from the *M.G.H.* text of Birt. Of these instances no less than eighteen are a return to readings already printed by either Jeep or Koch or both. The remaining five are amongst the most valuable changes made—one is from the Isengrinian marginalia (*refluis*, I. 91); one is Postgate's emendation in *C.Q.* IV (1910) 258 (*crimina*, I. 152); one from the Excerpta Cuiaciana (*citavi*, I. 154); one from V^aA (*premet*, II. 160); and one an emendation by the editor himself (*Pontum*, II. 160). This may appear a small glean from a wide field: but the interest of this section lies chiefly in the critical notes, where with learning and sound sense Mr. Levy often justifies his retention or rejection of a reading or reviews the decisions of his predecessors. The reading of these notes makes one hope for a full exegetical commentary: and I note with pleasure that the editor has such a supplementary volume in mind.

W. H. SEMPLE.

University of Reading.

A SHORT HISTORY OF GREECE.

David M. ROBINSON: *A Short History of Greece*. Pp. xii + 227, 1 photo, 2 maps. New York: Huxley House, 1936. Cloth, \$3.

THIS volume (from a Chair in Johns Hopkins University) appears in a 'History of Civilization' series, whose editor states in a 'foreword' that Professor Robinson's is 'the first book on Greece to be written from the point of view of the history of civilization,' and that 'All of the various phases of Greek life are treated on such a high level of scholarship that the book is by far the most scholarly work in its field.' The author himself tells us that his work is 'based on extensive study and travel and excavations in Greek lands, on much reading and lecturing, and on some thirty-two years of experience in teaching ancient history to undergraduates, graduates, and teachers.'

With the best will in the world, the reviewer cannot say anything in support of the editor's claim. The mere

statements of fact in the narrative are not infrequently wrong, as when Croton is destroyed by Sybaris, or Thebes by the Spartans; what is more, there is little or no sign of any sense of their relative importance, even of the archaeological facts with which he displays so wide an acquaintance. Both the inclusions and the omissions seem haphazard. If the book is—as it must be—intended for readers to whom the subject is new, they will be constantly puzzled by unexplained allusions, and irritated or impressed (according to temperament) by the suggestion of vast stores of information withheld. The style is downright, staccato and at times facetious, with some locutions which might be thought to lack precision: Oedipus was 'transfigured to heaven at Colonus'; Megacles did not 'cherish' the treatment of his daughter by Pisistratus. We are given a detailed sketch of Schliemann's life (including the fact that one of the lawyers engaged

for his divorce-suit became vice-president of the United States, and the number of suits of clothes and pairs of shoes he had when he died), but no account of the Trojan war beyond a note on its date. There is no description or discussion of the origin and nature of the πόλις, so that the whole basis and structure of Greek society are left to be imagined. 'Solon's reforms were called an earthquake,' and in his time at Athens 'a very wealthy man did not have more than 100 acres.' Not a word is said of Cleisthenes's constitutional legislation, so that later references to its results are unintelligible to the reader. Herodotus's figures for the forces of Xerxes (though a footnote curtly informs us that 'most historians' reduce them to 10 p.c.), 'in view of our World War, do not seem so grossly exaggerated.' Alexander 'became vain and reckless. He drank more and acted like a madman. His mind was turned by his victories as his head was by a physical defect.' And so on, and so forth.

In the sections on literature and the arts there is even less coherence: abundance of information (not differing, apart from a number of rather minute modern conjectures, from what may be got in any elementary handbook), but

little instruction. 'Homer is a great literary epic writer. . . . Even the wasp has a soul in Homer and only a great humanist could think of that. . . . There are even subjective figures. . . . He is no missing link between a chattering ape and an evolved Vergil.' 'It is too bad that such a great genius as Aeschylus should have died from being hit on his bald head by a tortoise, as goes the legend which has influenced many a later writer.' From *The Frogs* 'Yale University has taken one of its football yells'—an instance of the enduring 'influence' of Aristophanes—but a footnote warns us of the recent disquieting emendation to *Bdekekekex*. Polybius 'influenced Livy and wrote on the Roman Constitution, putting forward the dictum of "soak the rich" long before Roosevelt.' Archimedes 'discovered the law of gravity by putting a plated gold crown in the water of his bath-tub when he was bathing. Everyone knows how he jumped out and ran through the streets yelling "Eureka! I have found it."' But there are fifteen pages of bibliography. The printed slip of typographical *errata* could be at least doubled in length.

A. F. GILES.

University of Edinburgh.

GREECE IN THE FOURTH CENTURY.

G. GLOTZ et R. COHEN: *Histoire Grecque*. Vol III. La Grèce au 4^{ème} Siècle: La Lutte pour l'Hégémonie. Pp. 538. Paris: Les Presses Universitaires. 1936. Paper, 60 fr.

THIS book was to be the joint work of M. Glotz (the general editor of the *Histoire Générale*, of which it forms part) and of M. Cohen; but the death of M. Glotz has thrown the entire burden of its production upon his partner. It is no disparagement to the distinguished scholar who planned the French counterpart to our Cambridge Histories to say that the present volume has not suffered from its transference into the sole hands of M. Cohen. We find in it the same mastery of detail and lucidity of statement as was to be expected from M. Glotz, together with a breadth of view and a

balance of judgment in which we may recognize the distinctive contribution of M. Cohen.

The obvious shortcomings of the Greek city-states in the fourth century, and, more especially, the virulence and prolixity with which they were denounced by contemporary Greek writers, offer a standing temptation to the modern historian of the period to descend on the theme of 'quantum mutatus ab illo.' M. Cohen has not kept himself entirely free from this tendency. In his introductory survey of the period he assumes on rather slender evidence a general growth of *latifundia* and a general fall of population in Greece; and he accepts the current belief that in the fourth century Greek individualism broke bounds and degenerated into egoism. Yet the

cardinal Greek sin of this, as of any other century, was not so much the insurrection of the individual against the group as the subordination of wider group loyalties to narrower ones: the men of the fourth century did not so much contract a new disease as nurse an inveterate one to a crisis. But if M. Cohen has filled in an occasional detail in too sombre a tone, his picture as a whole is accurate and well proportioned.

In his narrative chapters the author does not linger unduly over the abortive imperialisms of Sparta and Thebes. At the most, we may regret that he did not make passing mention of the scheme for general disarmament and voluntary enforcement of sanctions, which the peace congress of 371 readily passed and Sparta no less promptly stultified (Xenophon, *Hellenica*, VI. 3.18-4.3). On the other hand he treats Athens with especial but not excessive regard. Though he offers some penetrating criticisms of the Attic democracy, he is fearless in his appreciation of its good points. He shows up its calm good sense in the Restoration of 403-2, and the sagacity of its persistent and eventually successful attempts at financial reform.

Among the leading personages at Athens he dismisses Isocrates as a journalist, albeit the greatest of his kind. He passes somewhat lightly over the blemishes of Demosthenes (e.g. his tergiversation in regard to the Phocians); but he brings into clear view the essential ingredients of his statesmanship—his practical executive ability at times of crisis, and his Themistoclean readiness to merge the interests of Athens in the greater cause of Greek solidarity.

The author also does substantial justice to Philip of Macedon. By way of setting Philip's achievement into its proper framework he provides excur-

suses on the geography and history of Macedon and on the structure of the Amphictionic League, embodying the researches of recent French, German and Italian scholars. He makes a liberal allowance for Philip's astuteness, and a scanty one for Greek perversity, in assuming that the king engineered the Amphictionic crisis of 339; and in stating that the federal constitution which Philip gave to Greece in 338-7 was merely intended to register his decisions and could be summoned by him alone, he takes his stand on uncertain ground. The federal constitution of Demetrius Poliorcetes, which followed closely the lines of Philip's scheme, gave a considerable measure of initiative to the Greeks. But M. Cohen makes the capital point that the ambitions of Philip were personal and dynastic rather than national, and that Greeks and Macedonians stood in a relation of virtual parity under him.

In his concluding chapters on Greek thought and art the author writes with his usual maturity of judgment. Among his salient points are his emphasis on the continued vitality of Greek art, and of Attic comedy; the great progress achieved in the field of mathematics; the influences of Plato and of Aristotle on the world's thought.

I forbear to draw up the usual catalogue of passages in which the reviewer's blue pencil has lightly underscored the text. But in anticipation of a second edition of this book I would draw attention to a few slips.

The brother of Aeschines was named Philochares, not Philocrates (p. 287); the naval battle in which Dio defeated Dionysius II was fought in 356, not in 366 (p. 411); the successor of Plato was not Xenophon, but Xenocrates (p. 437).

M. CARY.

University of London.

PUBLIC ARBITRATION AT ATHENS.

H. C. HARRELL: *Public Arbitration in Athenian Law*. (University of Missouri Studies, XI i.) Pp. 42. Columbia: University of Missouri, 1936. Paper, \$1.25.

THIS is a useful dissertation, in which we find, properly arranged, all the

evidence that exists on the subject; and if Dr. Harrell's conclusions are not very novel (he generally follows Bonner where the latter differs from Lipsius), they are not the worse for that. There is however one important matter in which (I think) he is wrong. He trans-

lates *ἔφεσις* by 'appeal', as though the arbitrators' court was an independent tribunal, from which an appeal could be made to a higher court (the dicastery). But the correct meaning of *ἔφεσις* is 'reference', and proceedings before the arbitrator were only a stage in a single trial. Of course either party could end the case before it reached the dicastery, the prosecutor by withdrawing his claim, the defendant by agreeing to it, or by a compromise (for example, settlement by private arbitration), or by both accepting the arbitrator's view; but that was because all cases which went before the public arbitrators were private ones, which could be settled at any stage 'out of court'. That was why there was no prosecution for perjury before the arbitrator: the case was not finished, and the witnesses' effective oath (if I may so call it) was only given before a jury. Nor was the object of arbitration 'nothing less than an attempt to reduce the number of cases requiring costly hearings in the heliastic courts',

though that may have been one of its desirable results. (That was the object of private arbitration and its recognition by the state.) It was to secure a proper sifting of the evidence before the case came before the jury, and so a more orderly trial—arbitration being equivalent to *ἀνάκρισις* in all other cases; and to prevent, among other things, either party from springing new evidence upon his opponents at the last minute. It was for the same reason that all the evidence had to be in writing and sealed before the case came before the jury. It must be remembered that all proceedings before the jury (inevitably in Athenian practice) were strictly limited in time. But though I think Dr. Harrell does not appreciate the principles of Attic legal procedure, that does not much detract from the usefulness of his work, except for 'those students of history and of law who have no Greek whatever', whom also he had in mind when writing it.

A. W. GOMME.

University of Glasgow.

THERMI IN LESBOS.

Winifred LAMB, M.A., F.S.A.: *Excavations at Thermi in Lesbos*. Pp. xii + 228; 61 figures, 50 plates, 8 folding plans. Cambridge: University Press, 1936. Cloth, £2 12s. 6d.

AFTER five seasons spent in excavating most thoroughly the important prehistoric settlement near the village of Thermi on the east coast of Lesbos, Miss Lamb has now, with a speed to be commended to more dilatory excavators, produced this excellent and fully documented report on the work with a full catalogue of the finds.

The mound proved to be admirably suited to the excavator's purpose of elucidating the connexions between Anatolia and the Aegean in the Early Bronze Age, for here, beneath some remains of the Middle and Late Bronze Ages, lay intact a series of five 'towns' which extended in time over practically the whole of the required period. These 'towns,' which the report calls Thermi I-V, starting from the earliest, are to be equated with the periods Troy I

and II on the mainland, and an inclusive dating of c. 3200-2400 B.C. is suggested for the sequence, based on Anatolian and Mesopotamian synchronisms and parallelisms which have been worked out by Frankfort and others.

The remains of later periods at Thermi, though sparse and disconnected, sufficed to give some pointers to the later history of the island and to its function as a link between Asia Minor and Greece in the Middle and Late Bronze Ages. In particular, a conflagration which appears to have put an end to the topmost occupation will be of special interest to Homeric scholars. Miss Lamb offers it to them, if they will accept it, as a link with the real Achilles and his raid on Lesbos (*Il.* IX. 129-30) at the beginning of the Trojan War, for, she remarks, 'there is nothing foreign on the site which can be dated after 1200 B.C. and nothing native which has any claim to be later than the destruction of Troy VI or VIIA.'

But it is with the Early Bronze Age

settlements that the report is mainly concerned. That the town did not extend farther back into a true Neolithic era was proved, in a fashion that must be the envy of those who excavate less responsive sites, by the discovery of a crucible for metal-working 'below the lowest floor-level and almost on virgin soil.' The connexion of Thermi I and II with the civilization represented on the mainland by Troy I and the Yortan graves is best illustrated by the red and black polished pottery, which in shape, technique and decoration has close affinity with the mainland wares. Metal and stone tools and marble idols bear out in full this connexion. Town III at Thermi was a somewhat lengthy intermediate stage showing a mixture of conservatism and innovation, when red and black wares vie with the newer brown technique, terra-cotta figurines gradually take the place of marble idols, and various architectural changes, such as the use of clay-lined 'bothroi' (perhaps storage or drainage pits) in houses, begin to make themselves felt. Towns IV and V show the newer civilization more developed, with brown ware dominant, with more accurately and regularly laid-out streets and houses, and with many other signs of an advance in prosperity and in knowledge of arts and crafts. This advance corresponds to that noted on the mainland between Troy I and Troy II, and it is natural

to suggest that it was the dominance of Troy II that reacted upon contemporary Thermi. At this time, too, evidence of western connexions with Macedonia and the European mainland, such as was absent in Thermi I and II, appears, and we may think of Lesbos at this period of the Early Bronze Age as an entrepôt between Anatolia and Greece and the Balkans. The earlier settlements were not fortified, as far as could be discovered, but Thermi V was undoubtedly surrounded by a wall; yet its end was peaceful, and if its existence depended upon the protection of the potentates of Troy II, it must have been deserted before Troy II was sacked.

Miss Lamb and her collaborators are to be congratulated on a report which is a model both of lucidity and of circumspection. The facts from which the historical deductions are drawn are set forth with the utmost care and attention to detail, and the author never lets her imagination carry her away into historical speculations unjustified by the evidence of her finds. The photographs, drawings and site-plans are plentiful and adequate, and the printing and production, apart from one or two minor errors, are up to the highest standards of the Cambridge University Press.

D. B. HARDEN.

Oxford.

DAEDALIC ART.

R. J. H. JENKINS: *Daedica: A Study of Dorian Plastic Art in the Seventh Century B.C.* Pp. xvi+95; 11 colotype plates and a frontispiece. Cambridge: University Press, 1936. Cloth, 7s. 6d.

THE term Daedalic has now come to be applied, not to those statues which embody the innovations attributed in literature to Daedalus, but to the phase of strong formalization preceding them, and succeeding the comparative naturalism of the late Geometric.

Mr. Jenkins' purpose is to trace the origins and development of the Dorian tradition in Greek plastic art during the seventh century B.C., and to dis-

tinguish the local characteristics of the four great Dorian schools—Corinth, Rhodes (Camirus), Sparta and Crete. He explains how the rarity of large sculptures dictates the use as evidence of smaller objects, especially the rich series of terracottas; and how the abundance of these and the comparative ease with which they can be classified make them a guide to artistic development in other monuments which no longer exist. The terracottas are divided into groups according to their local style (confirmed, since export is said to be unknown, by their places of discovery) and according to their artistic developments. These developments are

classified into three periods (the middle of which is again divided into three) and their absolute chronology is attempted.

Here there is one point tolerably well fixed, the proto-Corinthian aryballos in the Louvre, its top a female head, whose date is accepted, mainly on ceramic evidence, as about 650 B.C. There are some indications of a probable lower limit for the style about 620. The upper limit would seem to be somewhere in the first quarter of the seventh century, where a rapid transition and complete break between 'sub-Geometric' and Daedalic is claimed. But even the evidence cited lends no support to this claim: the head from Sparta (pl. I, 1) already has some of the elements of the Daedalic style in the horizontally-divided hair framing the face, and the row of spiral curls over the forehead; and the ivory sphinx from Perachora (*J.H.S.* 52, pl. 10), which has 'Daedalic' hair and horizontal forehead-band, sharply contrasts in the modelling of the face with the supposed Daedalic canon. We can assume, if we like, that there was a worker in some material through whose agency 'by a sudden and radical change all naturalism in plastic art is left behind and its place is taken by a rigid mathematical conception of the head which bears no direct relation to nature whatever': but if so, it is clear, from these two pieces alone, if their usual dating be accepted, first, that the elements of the 'new' style were not all novel; and second, that the innovations were sometimes adopted piecemeal by other artists; in short, that the change was in some places gradual, not sudden.

The main classification seems to be sound, and Mr. Jenkins' analysis of the elements of the style and the changes which they undergo is careful and interesting: some admirable comparisons are made, notably one between the head-vase from Arkhanes and the Delphian kouros (pl. VI, 1, 2). But some of the more minute chronological divisions seem to need further justification. They rest, it must be remembered, on an arbitrary, even if legitimate, selection from among a mass of material: apart from the limitation to terracottas, only frontal heads are admitted, no profiles;

few full-length figures, and no modelled heads. Even so they do not always carry conviction.

They rest also on an assumption, several times repeated, that Daedalic heads of all schools which show the same stylistic development are contemporary. But consider the probable circumstances: Four cities (if the industry had but one centre in each state) widely separated from each other, but, according to the view which Mr. Jenkins accepts, with no interchange of terracottas or their moulds. How do these alleged simultaneous changes take place? There is no possibility that all innovations (advances in style are made up of innovations) were made in all four schools at the same time independently. Therefore an innovation must have been made in one city and must then have passed from it to the others. According to Mr. Jenkins' view, every innovation, originating in whatever centre or material, took the same (and a minimum) time to travel to every other centre, and was immediately adopted there by every maker of terracotta moulds. The method of transit is not suggested; terracottas are ruled out, large sculpture is an improbable medium and we do not know how plentiful it was: there remain ivories and small bronzes. But unless there was an interchange of artists between the four centres, there must on his hypothesis have been a perfectly steady interchange of a large number of Daedalic objects of some kind. That is not impossible, but we are not entitled to assume it without evidence. Interchange there was, naturally, the resemblances cannot be explained otherwise; the progress of the style may have been more or less along the same lines in each of the four centres; but that it was exactly simultaneous in each, and in every object, seems to me not only unproved but contrary to probability.

In the second part of the book, the criteria deduced from the terracottas are applied to the stone monuments of the seventh century, to the Rhodian gold jewelry of Daedalic style in the British Museum, and to Daedalic heads on Etruscan bucchero vases. Of several

statues that have in the past been considered Daedalic, the fragment from Eleutherna is shown to be only just within, Cleobis and Biton, and the Laconian caryatid from Olympia to be definitely outside, the now more strictly defined Daedalic style: the technique of the goldsmith is shown to advance parallel with the advance of the style; but the Etruscan vases provide a sur-

prise by reproducing, within a period of thirty-five years, heads representing the stylistic development of the previous hundred and thirty years in Greece. A valuable piece of work, marred by a tendency to exalt hypothesis into dogma.

BERNARD ASHMOLE.

University of London.

CLASS-BOOKS.

1. KARL GERTH: *Lateinische Syntax*. Pp. 21. Berlin: Wedell, 1936. Paper, RM. 1.50.
2. A. M. CROFT: *Revision Exercises in Latin Syntax*. Pp. 90. London: Harrap, 1936. Cloth, 1s. 6d.
3. C. H. ST. L. RUSSELL: *Latin Unseens for School Certificate*. Pp. viii + 182. London and Glasgow: Blackie, 1936. Cloth, 2s. 6d.
4. E. C. MARCHANT: *A New Latin Reader*. Pp. xi + 130. London: G. Bell, 1936. Cloth, 2s.
5. *Latin Teaching: Commemoration Number, 1911-1936*. Pp. 79. Oxford: Blackwell, 1936. Paper, 3d. post free from the Secretary, 10 Church Street, Old Headington, Oxford.

Lateinische Syntax is a severely concentrated presentation of the chief rules of Latin syntax, closely printed and much abbreviated. Its severity contrasts with the many recent English school-books which aim above all at making Latin look attractive. *Revision Exercises in Latin Syntax* is a book of sentences sufficiently described by its name. *Latin Unseens for School Certificate* begins with a number of hints for candidates into which the author has compressed the experience of many years' teaching. He shows in detail how to tackle a piece of unprepared Latin, and adds notes on the commoner Latin authors, maintaining rightly that some knowledge of an author's style and range can be an important clue to his meaning. Short notes to the pieces abound in modern allusions, including 'wireless messages' from the gods, and the Loch Ness monster.

Mr. Marchant's book of *Unseens* recognizes the peculiar difficulty of

Latin verse translation to boys who can make a good showing on prose, and in this excellent little book he has printed opposite to selections from Ovid or Virgil the story of the piece written in simple Latin prose.

The most interesting of these volumes is the commemoration number of *Latin Teaching*, which includes reprints of articles written at intervals since 1914 on the subject of reformed Latin teaching. No schoolmaster who uses only the old methods could read these articles without a troubling of the conscience. He may console himself with the memory of his best pupils who, trained on the old method, reached a true appreciation of the Romans and their literature and a real facility in handling Latin. But if he has taken Classics in the Middle School, he must surely remember, for every one who reached that stage, six who had learnt Latin for eight years and at the end could read no Latin author with understanding, and could not write a simple sentence correctly. I have tried to teach many such myself, and remembering how little I did for them I wonder if I shall meet them again on the Judgment Day. The direct method for such boys could not at any rate be less effective than the old method and ought to be tried before it is condemned. The authors of the articles are ready for the usual criticisms, that Latin is not a spoken language, that for interpretation at least it is essential to translate, that translation is in itself a good exercise. In answering these charges they clearly differ about the meaning and extent of the direct method. But they do make out a strong case for

applying it to some part of the Latin hours; and the volume ends with some vivacious dialogues, poems and phrases which would enable a master to begin the experiment straight away. The best article in the book owes nothing at all to the direct method. It is a specimen

lesson by Professor Rose on a few, at first sight unpromising, lines of Horace. Every Classical teacher should read it, either in this volume or in a recent number of *Greece and Rome* where it was reprinted. J. T. CHRISTIE.

Repton.

GREEK MANUSCRIPTS IN THE ESCORIAL.

A. REVILLA: *Catálogo de los Códices Griegos de la Biblioteca de el Escorial*. Tomo I. Pp. cxxxiv+560. Madrid: Imprenta Helénica, 1936. Paper, 100 pesetas.

FOR our knowledge of the Greek manuscripts of the Escorial we depend at present on Miller's *Catalogue* (Paris, 1848) and on C. Graux's *Essai sur les origines du fonds grec de l'E.* (Paris, 1880). The present ambitious work begins with a long and valuable introduction on the history of the library and previous printed and unprinted catalogues.¹ It then describes codd. 1-178 in 548 pages, to Miller's 139. As there are nearly 600 numbers in all, two more volumes of like bulk will presumably be required. Each will have an index of its own, and the last will contain general indices.

Whereas Miller in most cases only stated number of leaves, age, and shape, with a short note of contents, Revilla offers a full bibliographical description of each codex, transcribes all inscriptions on the fly-leaves, and registers the contents scrupulously with *incipit* and *desinit*. Besides nos. 30-34 (Byzantine), which are not in Miller at all, many things which Miller missed have naturally come to light. Of classical works, Demosthenes I-XXII, *ep.* I-VI in cod. 20 (XIVth cent.), Plato's *Phaedrus* in 95 (XVth), and Moschus' *Ἔρως Δραπέτης* in 39 (XVth) are thus made known for the first time. Generally speaking, however, the Escorial has had little importance for classical Greek since the fire of 1671. This volume contains only one classical author in a MS. earlier than the XIVth century—the famous H of Xenophon's *Cyropaedia* (cod.

174, XIth-XIIth cent.)—and those of the XIVth-XVIth centuries are fewer than twenty: Aeschylus *Supplices* (135); various works of Aristotle (39, 72, 95, 101, 108, 118, 152, 160); Demosthenes XV, XVII, XIX, XXIV (73); I-XI (111); VIII, XVIII, XIX (115); Homer *Iliad* (87); Isocrates *Demon.* (74); Plato *def.* (82); *Cratylus* (108); Theocritus XIX (39); and Xenophon *Resp. Laced.* (87).

Type, format, and paper of the book are excellent; but we think that a *catalogue* ought to be issued bound, with the pages ready cut. What is more serious, the book teems with misprints and numerical errors, and it is rare to find the title of a foreign work correctly spelled. Worst of all, a user soon begins to entertain doubts of Revilla's competence for his task. It is uncomfortable to find ἡ παρὸνσα βίβλος ἐπράθη παρ' ἐμοῦ ἰω(άννου) τοῦ ἀλιότου πρὸς τ(ὸν) βέηκον κύ(ρον) θεόδωρον (sic) —p. 542—translated 'fué vendido por Teodoro Veccos a J. Alciato'. Almost every attempt to transcribe Greek without the aid of a printed text results in manifest blunders. Anyone who can allow himself to copy ὁ σάρκα λαθὼν ἐκ τῆς ἀγνῆς (sic) παρθένου, or who gives up βοᾷ σοι φωνὴν ἐκρυπαρῶν? χειλέων in despair (p. 4), is no reliable guide to Greek manuscripts. So it may well be that, when Miller transcribes a date as μηνὶ ἰουλλ. ε' ,αφπς' and Revilla gives it as μενὶ ἰουλλ, ιβ' ,αφπς, and in innumerable other discrepancies, the error is not with the earlier compiler, of whom the later has so little good to say (p. cxxvi).

It is a pity, then, that so useful and imposing a work inspires so little confidence in matters of detail. Yet with all its imperfections we are glad to have it.

J. ENOCH POWELL.

Trinity College, Cambridge.

¹ One of these, Ambr. Q 114 sup., is the work of a Scot, David Colville, who was assistant librarian from 1617 to 1627 (pp. cxiv. ff.).

Edoardo SCHWARTZ: *Figure caratteristiche della letteratura classica*. Traduzione di Ferdinando Belloni FILIPPI. Pp. 157. Lanciano: Giuseppe Carabba, 1936. Paper, L. 7. IN 1903 Eduard Schwartz published some lectures under the title *Charakterköpfe aus der antiken Literatur*. Hesiod and Pindar, Thucydides and Euripides, Socrates and Plato, Polybius and Posidonius, Cicero were the subjects. This brilliant little book went into five editions, and the Italian translation before us has been made from the fifth, which differs here and there from the first. So far as a reader imperfectly acquainted with both languages can judge, the work has been well done. Certainly it was worth doing, and it is to be hoped that the translator will be encouraged to do Schwartz's second series of *Charakterköpfe* (1907).

T. A. SINCLAIR.

Queen's University, Belfast.

David M. ROBINSON: *Pindar, a Poet of Eternal Ideas*. (Johns Hopkins University Studies in Archaeology, No. 21.) Pp. vi+118. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins Press (London: Milford), 1936. Cloth, 13s. 6d.

'PINDAR is full of thought' (p. 29). To convert a modern world, inclined to find him *fremdartig*, Professor Robinson assembles a large number of Pindar's Eternal Ideas, among which are found 'that our future lot is unknown', 'that what is done cannot be made undone', and 'the now commonplace thought that self-interest gets the better of wisdom'. Some of Pindar's more personal ideas and images are traced through later poetry, and in this there are points of interest, though but little discrimination; the author really thinks that commentaries on Pindar ought to be full of Landor just because Landor is full of Pindar—much as he thinks one reason for including a study of Pindar in an archaeological series to be the fact that you cannot fully understand Pindar without archaeology. He reports on Milton's copy of Pindar, but makes little of it. 'Pindar is one of the few Greek poets who was not an Athenian' (p. 2) is no more promising than 'Bowra's text is practically the same as that of Sandys, but occasionally it departs more freely from the readings of the MSS.' (p. vi), but the reader who perseveres will reach (p. 58) 'Pindar was a Boeotian, but I cannot agree with those critics who call him dull and stupid. He is an eagle and not a pig.'

H. D. F. KITTO.

University of Glasgow.

J. A. G. VAN DER VEER: *Reiniging en Reinheid bij Plato*: with a summary in English. Pp. xii+139. Amsterdam: H. J. Paris, 1936. Paper.

THIS is a good specimen of a doctoral dissertation. The author, being interested in Greek religious thought, found enough material in Plato alone, without using any other writer, to occupy him, and has wisely confined himself for the present to the philosopher's conceptions of purity. He begins by examining the words signifying 'pure' (*καθαρός*, *ἐλικρινής*, etc., and their cognates), starting from the material

senses, as when *ἀκίπαρος* is used of refined gold,¹ and proceeding to the passages in which they are used of spiritual or mental purity, as when an idea is refined or separated out from all irrelevant matter, or the character cleansed from moral evil. This naturally involves a consideration of Plato's attitude towards the means of purification, not only those which he himself recommends, philosophic thought and the influences of proper education, but the traditional expiatory rites. The author's general view, which seems to the reviewer eminently sane, is that Plato was neither a mere intellectualist nor a mystic—the latter word is used in a somewhat derogatory sense throughout.² An improvement could be effected here by more consideration of the varying attitude of the philosopher at different dates. A large part of the book is taken up with an examination of the *Laws*, especially their directions for the treatment of homicide, and here perhaps the interpretation of Plato's use of traditional rites, construed by him into agreement with his own ethics, is at its best. Dr. van der Veer is evidently well equipped for such researches, and it is to be hoped that he will find opportunity to write again and at greater length.

H. J. ROSE.

University of St. Andrews.

Otto W. HEICK: *The Ab Urbe Condita Construction in Latin*. Pp. 81. (University of Nebraska Studies.) Lincoln, Nebraska: University of Nebraska Library, 1936. Paper, \$1.

THIS doctorate thesis will be read with mixed feelings; and the time-honoured description of Rob Roy as 'too bad for blessing and too good for banning' may not unjustly be applied. The bibliography is exhaustive, the plan and arrangement are sound, the references are accurate, and the misprints unimportant except 'preceded' for 'preceded' on p. 66.

Yet the author seems at times strangely thoughtless and insensitive, and great though his zeal and diligence may be, he has shown insufficient care in sifting his material. Let every allowance be made for subjective interpretation: but when Dr. Heick classifies under Dubious Examples phrases which may also be interpreted (a) as ablative absolute or (b) as noun with participle in agreement (in place of a dependent clause), what right has he to put the following among the (presumably) certain instances of the *ab urbe condita* construction? (Cic.) *Comment. Pet. 53 ex vita acta*; Cic. *fin. 1. 63 omnium rerum natura cognita levamur*

¹ He slips, however, in his interpretation (p. 4) of *Polit.* 303D; the gold there, *τὸν λεγόμενον ἀκίπατον χρυσόν*, is plainly described by a traditional or technical term (*λεγόμενον*) meaning 'virgin', not 'uncommingled'. Several passages show a certain tendency to look so closely at one or two important words that the context is neglected.

² 'Dat Plato noch een eenzijdig intellectualist is, noch aan den anderen kant een mysticus' (Preface, p. ix).

superstitione; Hor. *serm.* 2. 3. 67 f. *an magis excors reiecta praeda*; Sen. *dial.* 12. 12. 5 *Menenius Agrippa aere conlato funeratus est* (see also Juv. 10. 46; 10. 59 f.; Petr. 59. 6).

There are still worse intruders, that cannot possibly have any more to do with *ab urbe condita* than with the Lost Ten Tribes: such are (amongst others) Cic. *fam.* 10. 16. 1 *Servilius rogatus rem distulit*; Q. fr. 3. 3. 3 *animum praebere ad illius perniciem moderatum, ad rerum eventum lenissimum*; Tac. *ann.* 1. 55 *post quod in arma itum*; Juv. 10. 173 f. *creditur velificatus Athos*; Cic. *Pis.* 18 *senatum populi Romani occasum atque interitum rei publicae lugere vetuisti*; Tac. *ann.* 4. 45 *pecunias e publico interceptas cohebat*. (The last two are grouped among the Dubious Examples.)

The following omissions have been noted: Ter. *Hec.* 742 *post factam iniuriam*; Cic. *dom.* 27 *dignitas aucta*; Tac. *ann.* 15. 39 *ipso tempore flagrantis urbis*.

The phrase *inter caesa et porrecta* (on p. 19) has the explanation *victima* appended, as if that were the plural of a neuter noun. On p. 66 the author appears to be hardly aware of the pitfalls surrounding such an expression as *occidentis dictator Caesar* (in the nominative). On p. 65 n. his remarks (otherwise sensible) on the absence of abstract nouns in Latin are quite spoiled by the suggestion that the abstract nouns corresponding to *manens* and *iniens* (*aetas*) would or could be respectively *manentio* and *ineuntio*! Surely these two must rank among the strangest wild-fowl that Nebraska ever produced.

R. G. NISBET.

University of Glasgow.

Philip Whaley HARSH: *Studies in Dramatic 'Preparation' in Roman Comedy*. Pp. v+103. Chicago: University Press, 1935. Paper.

THIS is a careful and objective study of certain types of *praeparatio* or *okovopia*, grouped under the main headings 'Preparation for certain types of important characters', 'Preparation for important phases of action', and 'Preparation for incidental phases of action', with separate consideration under each heading of the instances of false preparation or notable lack of preparation. The plan of the thesis is to apply the principles underlying Donatus' commentary to the cases in Terence which Donatus does not discuss and to all the parallel cases in Plautus and Menander.

It would scarcely be possible to write a play without producing examples of *praeparatio*, and the importance of Mr Harsh's thesis lies chiefly in its illustration of the extensive and consistent employment of preparation by the Latin dramatists. The negative instances of 'false preparation or notable lack of preparation' are not so interesting as might have been expected; the most significant occurs in a scene in the *Adelphi* which has been inserted entire from another play, as Terence himself tells us. Apart from this undoubted example of *contaminatio*, the special study of preparation leads Mr Harsh to conservative views, and indeed to the belief that for the plays of

Plautus no certain evidence of contamination has been brought forward, apart from the general statement of Terence.

The bulk of the thesis is a summary of instances, and is necessarily somewhat dry reading. It is hard to dispute any of Mr Harsh's statements. He shows common sense in rejecting some over-subtle suggestions of Donatus (whose ingenuity we must frequently admire), and finds that certain modern critics, notably Jachmann, have gone sadly astray at times, both in interpretation of particular passages and in general methods of research.

The effect of the thesis is materially to increase our respect for the skill with which the Latin plays *as we have them* are constructed, with the corollary that we must either think more highly of the Latin dramatists as original craftsmen or be more than ever suspicious of the attempts so repeatedly made to sift the 'attische Feinheit' from the botchwork of the Italian blacksmith, attempts which, resting largely on subjective appreciation, have led their distinguished authors to conclusions which are not merely divergent but often mutually opposed.

W. BEARE.

University of Bristol.

Giuliano BONAZZI: *Catulli Carmina*. Poesie di Gaio Valerio Catullo. Pp. xx+275. Rome: Signorelli, 1936. Paper, L. 15.

THIS edition, comprising an introduction, a text with an Italian verse translation on facing pages, and a series of notes on textual difficulties, cannot be regarded as a serious contribution to the study of Catullus. The author's competence for editing a Latin poet may be judged from the fact that he describes *mulier* as a dactyl, believes that *Oetaeôs* (62. 7) can be nominative singular, and writes (10. 9) *nil aequo in ipsa*, (61. 25) *nutriuntur humore* and (81. 3) *moribundu' ab sede* (for *moribundus*). Not content with these innovations of his own, he falsely ascribes unmetrical lines to Scaliger at 25. 5 and 29. 20. He accepts *et earum omnia adirem* (63. 54) in galliambics without question; at 27. 4 he puts *ebriosa acina* in his text, silently ignoring Gellius, but at 64. 16 cites Gellius' ill-judged preference for *ebria* in support of retaining the hiant *illa atque alia*; at 38. 2 he writes *male est me hercule et laboriose* without observing in his note that there is a hiatus. In matters of language his judgment is no more reliable. At 2. 8 he retains *ut cum gravis . . . ardor*, translating 'un tanto grande ardore' and quoting in support two examples of *ut cum maxime*; at 8. 15 he suggests that *ne* may be the asseverative particle without seeing that either *te* or *tibi* is thus left in air; at 66. 91 he writes *non verbis esse tuam me* and assumes the startling construction *effice me esse tuam*. His suggestions of *avelle* (55. 9: a syncopated form of *avellite*) and *properere* (66. 45: also a 'forma sincopata', it appears, but of what?) are unlikely to survive.

C. J. FORDYCE.

University of Glasgow.

Gino FUNAIOLI: *Horas als Mensch und Dichter*. Pp. 27. Cologne: Petrarca-Haus, 1936. Paper. RM. 1.

THIS lecture, delivered before the Deutsch-Italienisch Kulturinstitut in Cologne, is an eloquent and imaginative appreciation of Horace, more as *Mensch* than as *Dichter*. The author takes the poetic forms in turn and with much sympathy and understanding characterizes the poet as he appears in each. His Horace is essentially *solibus aptus*, mild and cheerful; we hear little or nothing of the more solemn mood which inspired some of his best poetry, *Diffugere nives* and the rest. The style is perhaps a shade too purple for English taste; here is a characteristic specimen, *à propos* of the *Epistles*: 'Es ist das milde, weiche Licht eines nachdenklichen Herbstes, das der Wahrheit des Lebens und der Seele neuen Reiz verleiht, und sie erleuchtet und mit jener Klarheit zeichnet, wie sie die durchsichtige Septembersonne den Dingen gibt, wenn der Regen das Grün der Wälder und Felder verjüngt hat, und eine süsse Melancholie den tiefblauen Himmel durchweht und die Luft und den Sonnenuntergang.' There is little in this lecture for a reviewer to take hold of—less, for instance, than in those on the same subject given by Dr Glover at Bristol and by Richard Heinze to German officers in Rumania; but the general effect is of a polished *ἀγώνισμα ἐς τὸ παρα-χρημα ἀκούειν*.

L. P. WILKINSON.

King's College, Cambridge.

Virgil, with an English translation by H. Rushton FAIRCLOUGH. Vol. I (Eclogues, Georgics, Aeneid I-VI). Revised edition. Pp. xvi+593. (Loeb Classical Library.) London: Heinemann, 1935. Cloth, 10s. (leather, 12s. 6d.).

THE original edition of this book appeared in 1916. After a personal and obviously careful examination of the principal codices, Mr. Fairclough has now enlarged and improved his apparatus criticus by adding a number of variants (chiefly from M and P); he also records his not infrequent disagreements with Sabbadini. I have noticed thirteen changes in the text, and there may be others. The translation (which shows few alterations besides those caused by changes of text) is workmanlike and reliable, and there are numerous useful explanatory notes.

An entirely new appendix of twenty-one pages—compiled presumably before April 1932, the date of the preface—contains bibliographical notes and comments on points suggested by recent Virgilian literature, especially in connexion with Mackail's edition of the *Aeneid*. Not only are standard works mentioned, but also the more important of recent articles in periodicals. Serious omissions are rare, and in any case such a list could not satisfy everyone; I myself should have liked to see a reference to (e.g.) Skutsch's work on the *Bucolics*, Carcopino's *Virgile et les origines d'Ostie*, Bridges' *Ibant Obscuri*, and Sparrow's *Half-lines and Repetitions in Virgil*. But the

selection is very fair and judicious. This appendix much enhances the value of the book, whose scope is considerably wider than that of the average Loeb edition; alike from its utility and from its trustworthiness this volume shows that the series at its best still merits a place in the scholar's library.

A few small misprints should be corrected in future impressions: p. xv, Haverfield's revision of Conington-Nettleship was published in 1898 (not 1883, as is implied); p. 241, note 1, and p. 333, note 1, for ix read xi; p. 586, for Kricala read Kvičala; p. 589, for Virgilis read Virgilio.

R. G. AUSTIN.

University of Glasgow.

J. BRAUNE: *Nonnos und Ovid*. Pp. 41. (Greifswalder Beiträge zur Literatur- und Stilforschung, Heft 11.) Greifswald: Dallmeyer, 1935. Paper.

MR. BRAUNE examines the stories of Phaethon, Cadmus, Actaeon, and Daphne in Ovid's *Metamorphoses*, and argues that there are touches in Nonnus which prove that he was acquainted with Ovid. Scholars have been too ready to deny that Nonnus can have owed anything to Ovid, and Mr. Braune does well to re-open the question; but he himself is too prone to see significance in small and natural similarities. This is particularly apparent in the chapter on the story of Daphne. The evidence that Nonnus borrowed from Ovid's story of Cadmus is also rather weak, but a much stronger case is made out for his use of the story of Actaeon. In his chapter on the story of Phaethon Mr. Braune makes several good points against previous writers, and if he does not quite prove, as he is convinced that he does, that Nonnus drew on Ovid, he certainly shows it to be probable. When it is argued that the first speech of Helios in Nonnus XXXVIII. 196 ff. is an insertion based on Ovid, and it is asserted that 'die beiden Halbverse 194 und 212 schliessen inhaltlich eng aneinander an', it must be observed that, if the whole speech is removed, what results, as we have the text now, is *ὁ δὲ (sc. Phaethon) πλέον ἤδῃ μύθῳ αἰρίζων λίσσεται . πᾶς δὲ . . . (sc. Phaethon)*.

Mr. Braune is not properly acquainted with what has already been written on his subject. He never discusses or mentions L. Castiglioni's 'Studi intorno alle fonti e alla composizione delle Metamorfosi di Ovidio' in *Annali della R. Scuola Normale Superiore di Pisa, Filosofia e Filologia*, Vol. XX, Pt. 2, 1907, nor his chapter on Actaeon and Artemis in *Studi critici offerti da antichi discepoli a Carlo Pascal*, (Catania, 1913), pp. 53-120, nor his 'Epica Nonniana' in *Rendiconti del R. Istituto Lombardo di Sci. e Lett.* LXV, 1932, pp. 309-337.

Perhaps Mr. Braune will proceed to make a similar examination of other parts of Nonnus. It would be worth doing even if the results proved inconclusive.

G. B. A. FLETCHER.

University of Liverpool.

Emanuele CESAREO: *Il Panegirico nella Poesia latina*. Pp. iv+127. Published by the author at Via Catania, N. 15, Palermo, 1936. Paper, (for export) L. 60.

THE author starts with a brief account of panegyric and encomiastic literature among the Greeks, particularly compositions of Isocrates and Theocritus. He continues through Catullus, Virgil, Tibullus, Horace, Propertius and Ovid, not forgetting the post-Augustan poets and some anonymous works. Some of the material consists of completely panegyric poems—e.g. the Panegyric of Messalla (pseudo-Tibullus III 7=IV 1), the anonymous *Laus Pisonis*, and some short pieces from Catullus, Horace, and others—while the rest is taken from laudatory passages contained in non-panegyric works—e.g. Virgil *Aeneid* VI 788 ff., Ovid *Metam.* XV 849 ff. The author promises to confine himself to *panegirici veri e proprii*; but what he means by that he never clearly tells us. Apparently any laudatory passage in Latin poetry comes within his scope; though he gives the greater part of his attention to the praise accorded by poets to contemporary persons and in a lesser degree to the illustrious dead. Nevertheless Catullus' raptures over Sirmio are treated, but Virgil's panegyric of Italy is stated to be outside the author's task (p. 51). Hymns to gods are generally ruled out; but Horace *Odes* I 10 secures a mention, as standing (why more than other hymns of praise?) between the hymn and the panegyric. Another curious point: the author treats the Einsiedeln eclogues twice (pp. 107 and 109) apparently without realizing it.

Passages are quoted copiously, and readers are afforded a useful survey of panegyric in Latin poetry. The debt to Greek rhetorical models is pointed out, sometimes precisely, sometimes a little vaguely, but without exaggeration. Most people will agree with the aesthetic judgments in this book, which are sound and tasteful, if at times somewhat obvious. It is refreshing to find a high rank assigned to Calpurnius Siculus. ARNOLD M. DUFF.

University College of Wales, Aberystwyth.

Jessie Helen Louise WETMORE: *Seneca's conception of the Stoic Sage as shown in his prose works*. Pp. 66. University of Alberta, 1936. Paper.

THIS work is a 'thesis submitted to the University of Alberta in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Master of Arts' and its publication is 'authorized by the Faculty Committee on University publications.' It is not for a reviewer to judge whether the work is adequate to the purpose for which it was written, but it is certainly difficult to see why it was considered worthy of publication.

Miss Wetmore tells us in her preface that her subject is 'a study of the character of the Sage or Wise Man, as developed in the whole Stoic philosophy, and more particularly as set forth in the prose writings of Seneca'. Of the whole work only the first three chapters, that is, 25 out of the 61 pages of text, are really relevant to the subject, and of these three chapters only

two contain any appreciable amount of original research. Chapter I, 'The Sage of the orthodox Stoic tradition', is taken almost entirely, often practically verbally, from Arnold's *Roman Stoicism*. Chapter II, 'The Novitiate', deals with what the novice must do and with the truths which he must learn (but makes no attempt to consider the stages into which his development may be divided [*vide* Sen., *Ep.* 75, 8 ff.]). Chapter III deals with 'The Just Man made perfect'. These two chapters, II and III, contain all the original research on the subject in the thesis, and even they are largely a collection and paraphrase of Seneca's statements, with insufficient references to the text. The remainder of the thesis is mainly irrelevant, and, in spite of the claims of the preface, such relevant questions as how the conception of the Sage was altered or developed in the course of time are completely ignored.

M. J. BOYD.

Queen's University, Belfast.

Tacitus: *Selections from his Works*. Edited with Introduction and Notes by F. B. MARSH and H. J. LEON. Pp. xi+546; illustrations. New York: Prentice-Hall, 1936. Cloth, \$2.25.

THIS is a first-rate book, containing selections from the *Annals*, the whole of the *Agricola* and part of the *Germania*, skilfully edited by two experts for American undergraduates. The editors have provided a comprehensive introduction to the study of Tacitus, which should, as they anticipate, prove useful to teachers as well as to students. All the editorial work is scholarly and up-to-date. In the notes on controversial passages the explanation preferred is clearly stated and followed by a brief reference to other views. Occasionally a little more help seems to be called for in difficult or oddly expressed passages: at *Annals*, I, 41, for example, a beginner will surely be baffled by *socer Drusus* etc. The introduction is excellent, both in style and in matter. There are summaries, maps, portraits, and a well-chosen bibliography, which includes a section on fiction and drama based on the reigns of Tiberius and Nero.

The selections from the *Annals* are intended 'primarily to illustrate the characters of Tiberius and Nero and their courts. In general, discussions of political matters and foreign wars are not included'. No reason is given for the exclusion of the *Historiae*. Is it merely that there was no room for even the most celebrated passages, or that the subject matter was deemed unsuitable?

E. C. MARCHANT.

Lincoln College, Oxford.

J. WYTZES: *Der Streit um den Altar der Viktoria*. Die Texte der betreffenden Schriften des Symmachus und Ambrosius mit Einleitung, Uebersetzung und Kommentar. Pp. 159. Amsterdam: H. J. Paris, 1936. Paper, 2.90 fl.

THE dispute about the altar to Victoria has been much written about, and classical scholars will have learnt of it from Dill if from no other book. But the original texts are accessible only

in unwieldy and (in the case of Symmachus) expensive works. It was therefore a very happy idea of Wytzes to reprint these passages from Seck's Symmachus and to edit the relevant letters of Ambrose. The original Migne edition of Ambrose is apparently inaccessible to him, and the later is disfigured by numerous misprints. Wytzes has therefore collated certain MSS in Italy, most of them of late date. There is a considerable introduction dealing with Ambrose as an opponent of paganism, and with the views and ideals of the national pagan party. This introduction is based on ancient authorities, alike literary and inscriptional, and these are illustrated from modern works bearing on the subject. Certain readers will no doubt be helped by the German translation, and the commentary is adequate. The work concludes with a bibliography.

The texts suffer from a certain ignorance of fourth-century orthography. *Conniventiam* (p. 62) should be *coniuventiam*, *multa* (p. 84) should be *multa*, and *Coelestem* (p. 94) should be *Caelestem*. A scripture quotation on p. 62, l. 13 is unrecognized. There are several misprints: *subscriptonis* (p. 68), *Carthageniensibus* (p. 76), *privelegiis* (p. 124), *elegantiam* (p. 136), *privelegium* (p. 141), two lines transposed (p. 152), Abbot (p. 156) for Abbott, Theeuwen (p. 159) for Teeuwen. Why *laudata* should be preferred to *laudanda* of the MSS (p. 78, l. 17), I do not understand.

A. SOUTER.

University of Aberdeen.

Passio Sanctarum Perpetuae et Felicitatis.

Volumen I. Textum Graecum et Latinum ad fidem codicum MSS. edidit Dr Cornelius Ioannes Maria Joseph VAN BEEK. Accedit Acta Brevia SS. Perpetuae et Felicitatis. Vol. I (of series). Pp. 8+166*+160; 9 photographs. Nijmegen: Dekker en van de Vegt, 1936. Stiff paper, fl. 6.

THE present edition is on a scale and of a minuteness which far surpasses those of any of its predecessors. It contains an excellent bibliography, an introduction discussing the manuscripts with their relation and value, the printed editions, the relations between the Greek and Latin texts, and the question of author; also an introduction to the *Acta* on similar lines. Then follow critical editions, with apparatus, of the *Passio* in both languages and of the *Acta*. The book concludes with full indexes to both works and nine admirable photographs of rotographs. The second volume is reserved for an explanatory and illustrative commentary.

It is rarely that one encounters an edition of an ancient work that can be so unreservedly commended, and I will use the rest of my space to refer to certain points that are capable of improvement. P. 8*, for 'Teufel' read 'Teuffel'; p. 14*, for 'Frederic' read 'Francis'; p. 17* (and p. 2), for 's. X/XI' read 's. XI med.' (the author does not know Lowe's *Beneventan Script*); p. 25*, read 'Ashburnham' for 'Ashburnam'; p. 32*, *adulescentes* is the correct spelling; p. 43*, the Lorsch catalogue is now assigned to the ninth century; p. 7 and else-

NO. CCCLXV. VOL. L.

where, 'Peoukâros, not 'Peoukâros, and p. 5, *Novôn*, not *Novôn*.

A. SCUTER.

University of Aberdeen.

Theodore SILVERSTEIN: *Visio Sancti Pauli: The History of the Apocalypse in Latin together with nine texts.* Pp. xii+229. London: Christophers, 1935. Paper, 20s.

DR. M. R. JAMES published an interesting Latin form of this Apocalypse over forty years ago in *Texts and Studies*, and an English translation of it in his *Apocryphal New Testament*. The present study, which appears as the fourth part of *Studies and Documents*, edited by Professor and Mrs. Lake, is much the most comprehensive treatment of the Latin texts that has appeared. In fact only three of the nine forms of the text here published have previously been printed. What Silverstein calls 'redaction IV' has not been printed here, partly because it has been several times printed, but especially because a new and critical edition of it demands a separate work. The development of the various forms is fully discussed and the chief interpolations are elucidated. The notes are most valuable and learned. This Apocalypse exercised very wide influence throughout the Middle Ages and is well worth the elaborate treatment it here receives. I note that the MS. at Osma, no. 116 (saec. XIV-XV), is not mentioned, and that the full bibliography omits Professor John E. B. Mayor's valuable linguistic study of the James text in the *Journal of Philology* for 1894.

A. SOUTER.

University of Aberdeen.

William Robbins RIDINGTON: *The Minoan-Mycenaean Background of Greek Athletics.* Pp. 94. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania, 1935. Paper.

THIS is a doctoral dissertation of the University of Pennsylvania and shows the diligence and good information which one may expect in the better American productions of this kind. The author starts from a suggestion of G. Glotz that Greek athletics are not an importation by Hellenic invaders but a tradition already existent in older times, and states the case for this position with learning and moderation which augur well for any future researches he may undertake.

His argument falls into two main parts. Firstly, the sites of the four Great Games, and also Athens and Delos, are all connected more or less closely with Crete or with Minoan-Mycenaean culture in some form, either by archaeological evidence, myths or casual references in the older literature, especially Homer, or some combination of these. He is naturally selective in his treatment of this topic, putting forward as possible a number of suggested connections which are by no means proved; he makes no claim to certainty either for his own combinations or for the views of the modern authors he cites, but sets them out for what they are worth. On the whole, his case so far may be taken as proved, or as near proof as is possible on the available evidence.

Secondly, the Minoans at all events show by

Q

their art that they took an interest at least in some forms of athletics, such as boxing, and made a public show of them on occasion; while the later Cretans had a name especially for their running.

Therefore the Cretans may have founded athletic festivals in Greece before the Achaean invasions and thus contributed largely to the tradition of sport which existed in classical Greece.

Put in this form, as a possibility (and the author probably would claim little more for his thesis), the view is reasonable enough. Arguments might be brought forward tending to show that the likelihood of its being true is but slight in this or that case; but enough evidence is adduced to show that it cannot be dismissed as absurd.

H. J. ROSE.

University of St. Andrews.

Corpus Vasorum Antiquorum, U.S.A.: University of California, Fascicule 1. By H. R. W. SMITH. Pp. 60; 62 plates. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press (London: Milford), 1936. Cloth and boards, 22s. 6d.

THIS fascicule of the *C.V.A.* contains Mycenaean, geometric, seventh, sixth, and fifth century vases in the University of California. The production is admirable, the photographs detailed and good—only the Oxford and Cambridge fascicules are in the same class. The only general criticism which might be made is on the absence of dates: it would not have been difficult to give an approximate date for all the pieces, and it would have been helpful. Readers of Professor Smith's *Chalcidian Ware* and *Menon painter* will expect a good text, and the text here is careful and full. The general standard of the collection is high, and it contains some interesting vases. The following remarks are suggested by a reading of the text. Pl. II, an extremely fine Attic geometric jug. Pl. IV. 1. Reference might be made to Payne, *NC.*, p. 284. Pl. V. Why are all the aryballoi classed as *Middle Corinthian*? Pl. V. 11. Interesting comparison of 'football' aryballos to Peruvian gourd pottery. Pl. XI. Interesting Boeotian alabastra. Pl. XIV. The author replies to Rumpf and Kraiker on the origin of Chalcidian. Pl. XV. 1. Little master cup; very strange that Theseus should be bearded on one side and beardless on the other. The nonsense inscription with its repeated $\epsilon\tau\omicron\iota$ must be a reminiscence of a signature; a lip cup in the Manchester Museum has $\epsilon\tau\omicron\iota\epsilon\tau\omicron$, which I think must be the same (reproduced in *Manchester Memoirs*, lxxx, pl. III. 1.). Pl. XVIII. Are these Attic and not Boeotian? Pl. XX. 1. A very fine Geryonomachy in the tradition of the Antimenes painter. 'Herakles fights with his sword; he has cut down Eurytion and wounded one body of the monster and apparently the second.' Or has he shot them *eminus*, as in the 'Exekias'? Only, the later painter is too much of a realist to put in the arrows. Pl. XXV. 1. Very interesting eye *olpe*. Pl. XXVII. 2: 'not later than 520 B.C.' I should have thought from shape and drawing thirty years earlier. Pl. XXX. 1. Very interesting front view of horse.

Pl. XLVII. Perhaps the gem of the collection. A magnificent hydria, about 400 B.C. The Birth of Dionysos: Semele lying in the middle, Hermes carrying off the child, Iris trying to intervene; Zeus, Aphrodite and Hera looking on. The whole fascicule is excellent in manner and matter.

T. B. L. WEBSTER.

University of Manchester.

Sylloge Nummorum Graecorum. Volume I. Part ii. The Newnham Davis Coins in the Wilson Collection of Classical and Eastern Antiquities, Marischal College, Aberdeen. By E. S. G. ROBINSON. London: Milford, 1936. Paper, 7s. 6d.

UNLIKE the second volume, three parts of which have recently been noticed in *C.R.*, the first volume of the *Sylloge* is not to be devoted to a single large collection, but is to include several which are comparatively small. The present instalment comprises the 490 coins from the Newnham Davis cabinet, which have found a home in Marischal College, Aberdeen, under the care of the Wilson Trustees. They form a representative and very interesting series, now for the first time made accessible to students everywhere. One or two of them are unique, and some of the Sicilian examples are particularly fine, one of the rarest of these being the Syracusan tetradrachm signed by the engraver Sosion. Among the nine Cretan coins are several which will attract the practised eye at once. But the most important single group is the set that illustrates the mintage of the Seleucid Kings of Syria, and there the most remarkable piece is a splendid double-stater of gold, overstruck on a double daric and probably issued by Seleucus I as satrap of Babylon.

The fourteen plates are admirably executed. For purposes of study they are almost as useful as the originals, at all events when combined with the succinct editorial commentary. The latter tells the specialist everything that it is essential for him to know. It is indeed rather less austere than that of Part i, a modification which is all to the good. Attention may once again be called to the extremely moderate price at which the *Sylloge* is being published. The British Academy is conferring a real boon upon numismatists, and not upon numismatists alone.

GEORGE MACDONALD.

Edinburgh.

Walther KOLBE: *Die Weltreichsidee Alexanders des Grossen*. Pp. 24. Freiburg im Breisgau: Hans Speyer, 1936. Paper, M. 1.

THIS brilliant lecture may be unreservedly praised; it is worthy of its subject, and everyone interested in Alexander should read it. It is not an essay on Alexander's 'world-kingdom'; it is an examination of the nature of the realm he contemplated with regard to the non-Macedonian peoples, and its striking feature is that Professor Kolbe fully accepts the view that Alexander's purpose was internationalism or co-operation; he 'sowed not hate but love' (p. 13). Kolbe gives full value to the evidence of Eratosthenes and Plutarch, and

shows that the silence of Ptolemy is no objection in view of Ptolemy's personal attitude. He has a new and important reason for believing that the prayer at Opis included more than Macedonians and Persians, Alexander's aim being a reconciliation of *all* peoples; 'der Gedanke einer allgemeinen Weltverbrüderung ist geboren.' Kolbe's adherence to this view is the more notable because the last page indicates that he personally would side with Nationalism; but he is too good a scholar to let that affect his estimate of the evidence. No Hellenistic State, he says, carried on Alexander's idea. That is correct today; I trust that presently we may be pointing to the Euthydemids.

Muirtown, Inverness. W. W. TARN.

ERICH BETHE: *Ahnenbild und Familiengeschichte bei Römern und Griechen*. Pp. xiii + 121; 7 illustrations. Munich: Beck, 1935. Export prices: Cloth, RM. 2.85; unbound, 2.10.

THE title of this book might suggest, at any rate as far as the Roman part is concerned, a detailed treatment of ancestral portraiture such as we have had recently from the pen of Dr. A. Zadoks-Josephus Jitta, or an elaborate analysis of family history on the lines laid down by F. Münzer and W. Schur. Instead we find a pleasantly written series of short chapters dealing with the distinctive attitude of the Greeks and Romans towards their ancestors and their family history. Dr. Bethe emphasizes the essential difference between the Greek, who ever sought to connect his family with the gods and heroes of the past, and the Roman, who merely wished to keep alive the memory of his ancestors' services to the state in peace and war. In tracing this fundamental difference of outlook Dr. Bethe ranges over a variety of subjects such as portraiture, burial customs, family and personal names, sepulchral inscriptions, sport, and manual labour. If much of the ground covered is well-trodden, the treatment is fresh, sympathetic and stimulating. In a few points some readers may not go all the way with the author, e.g. in his belief in the worship of ancestors at Rome: he suggests that originally the Roman buried the members of his family, or at any rate the *paterfamilias*, in the house itself, and that when this practice was

discontinued the *imagines* of the ancestors were set up instead, in order that the ancestors themselves might in some real sense continue to live there ('man wollte die Ahnen, sie selber, lebendig und wirksam in nächster Nähe, im eigenen Hause festhalten', p. 26). The book is attractively produced, although incidentally it may be noted that in chapter VIII reference numbers 20-37 are misplaced.

H. H. SCULLARD.

King's College, London.

R. J. FORBES: *Bitumen and Petroleum in Antiquity*. Pp. 109; numerous illustrations, diagrams, and maps. Leiden: Brill, 1936. Cloth, f. 2 or 5s.

MR. FORBES has produced in a condensed and very readable form the information available about the early history of petroleum, but his work is no mere compilation. It owes much to the investigations of its author into the composition of bituminous building-materials which have been discovered at Tell Asmar and other places.

The knowledge and use of bitumen at a very early date in Western Asia is contrasted with the ignorance of bitumen, and the astonishing properties attributed to it, in Europe from the time of the Roman Empire until a fairly recent date. This is shown to be due to the fact that during this period the great surface deposits of Mesopotamia were not under European control.

The use of petroleum and similar hydrocarbon mixtures in the various forms of 'Greek fire' is discussed in a brief but interesting chapter, while the more important applications (building, waterproofing, heating, lighting, adhesives, etc.) receive ample treatment.

The book is interspersed with microphotographs of materials used in brick-making, photographs of masonry from Babylon and Ur in which bituminous mortar has been employed, and other excellent illustrations. Numerous diagrams and tables make the discussions in the text easy to follow. This important contribution to our knowledge of bitumen concludes with a bibliography of 160 references.

K. C. BAILEY.

Trinity College, Dublin.

SUMMARIES OF PERIODICALS

(A reference to C.R. denotes a notice already published in the *Classical Review*.)

PHILOLOGISCHE WOCHENSCHRIFT.

(JUNE—AUGUST, 1936.)

GREEK LITERATURE.—L. Weber, *Solon und die Schöpfung der attischen Grabrede* [Frankfurt, 1935, Schulte-Bulmke. Pp. vii + 118] (A. Scherer). Though mainly based on deduction owing to scarcity of direct evidence, W.'s general argument is acceptable. Learned and penetrating.—R. Pfeiffer, *Die neuen Δημόφους*

zu Kallimachosgedichten [C.R. XLIX, 176] (E. Kalinka). Mainly textual emendations and new interpretations. Generally convincing.—*Galeni in Hippocratis Epidemiarum librum I commentaria III* ed. E. Wenkebach; in *Hippocratis Epidemiarum librum II commentaria V* in Germ. ling. transtulit F. Pfaff [C.R. XLIX, 205] (F. E. Kind). A monument of learned industry and thoroughness. Can justly be called an editio princeps.—H. O. Schröder, *Galeni in Platonis Timaeum Commentarii fragmenta*

[C.R. XLIX, 205] (H. Westenberger). This conscientious work displays thorough mastery of the material in all its ramifications. All questions are handled with cautious yet clear judgment.

LATIN LITERATURE.—M. Pohlenz, *Antikes Führertum. Cicero de officiis und das Lebensideal des Panaetios* [C.R. XLIX, 28]; *Cicero de officiis III* [Berlin, 1934, Ges. d. Wiss. zu Göttingen. Pp. 39]; *Τὸ πρῶτον. Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte des griechischen Geistes* [Berlin, 1933, Ges. d. Wiss. zu Göttingen. Pp. 40] (R. Philippson). These form an exemplary commentary on the *De Officiis* and also add substantially to our understanding of Cicero and Panaetius. Long review.—M. Iuniani Iustini *Epitoma Historiarum Philippicarum Pompei Trogi*. Post Fr. Rühl ed. O. Seel [C.R. L, 38] (F. Walter). The excellent class r MSS form the basis of S.'s edition, which departs from Rühl's text in about 800 places. Reviewer quotes numerous instances.—L. A. Constans, *Cicéron, Correspondance*. Vols. I and II [C.R. XLIX, 189 and L, 71] (R. Philippson). Independent and important work, at times showing considerable textual divergences from previous editors. Excellent translation and introduction. An advance in every respect.—O. Tescari, *Lucretiana* [Turin, 1935, Soc. ed. internazionale. Pp. 110] (M. Schuster). Falls into five main groups, (1) Cicero and Lucretius, (2) Memmius, (3) L.'s personality, (4) his poetry, (5) his contemporaries and later times. Most stimulating and thoughtful.—Mary E. Keenan, *The life and times of St. Augustine as revealed in his letters* [C.R. L, 39] (A. Kurfess). Useful collection of material.

HISTORY.—P. Damerau, *Kaiser Claudius Gothicus* [C.R. XLIX, 148] (T. Lenschau). Commences with survey of sources. Main portion consists of critical account of the emperor's reign. Careful and interesting work.—L. C. West, *Roman Gaul. The objects of trade* [C.R. XLIX, 244] (W. Ensztlin). Notwithstanding criticisms of details this book is a valuable aid to the economic historian.—W. A. Laidlaw, *A history of Delos* [C.R. L, 30] (W. Ensztlin). Not only a well-written history of Delos, but also an excellent introduction to the archaeological results of excavations there.—I. M. Cobban, *Senate and Provinces* [C.R. L, 33] (F. Taeger). Combines sound political judgment with excellent training in method; one of the most valuable of recent works on the decades following Sulla's reforms.—*The Cambridge Ancient History. Vol. IX: The Roman Republic, 133-44 B.C. Vol. X: The Augustan Empire, 44 B.C.-70 A.D.* [C.R. XLVII, 188; XLIX, 197] (P. Thomsen). Valuable continuation of this great work.

PHILOSOPHY.—Lotte Labowsky, *Die Ethik des Panaetios* [C.R. XLIX, 191] (R. Philippson). Contains a wealth of original ideas. But reviewer expresses doubts about L.'s representation of Panaetius' philosophy of life and art.—Gred Ibscher, *Der Begriff des Sittlichen in der Pflichtenlehre des Panaetios* [Munich, 1934, Oldenbourg. Pp. 155] (R. Philippson). Though he finds much to criticize, reviewer warmly recommends this stimulating work.

LANGUAGE.—R. Till, *Die Sprache Catos* [C.R. L, 131] (A. Klotz). T. gives an excellent account of Cato's Latin. The section on words first attested in Cato is particularly valuable.

PALAEOGRAPHY.—S. de Ricci and W. J. Wilson, *Census of medieval and renaissance manuscripts in the United States and Canada, I* [New York, 1935, H. W. Wilson Co. Pp. xxiii + 1098] (P. Lehmann). Very full and useful catalogue. Reviewer congratulates R. on his excellent work and eagerly awaits its continuation.

EPIGRAPHY.—J. Kirchner, *Imagines Inscriptionum Atticarum* [C.R. XLIX, 227] (E. Ziebarth). 151 inscriptions on 54 plates with explanatory notes illustrate the history of Attic writing from 8th century B.C. to 4th century A.D. Highly praised.—L. Amundsen, *Greek Ostraca in the University of Michigan Collection. Part I: Texts* [C.R. XLIX, 228] (K. F. W. Schmidt). This volume of texts, to be followed by a commentary in a second volume, contains 699 ostraca. Reviewer discusses some of the readings.

ARCHAEOLOGY.—R. Laur-Belart, *Vindonissa, Lager und Vicus. Römisch-Germanische Forschungen, Band 10* [Berlin, 1935, de Gruyter. Pp. vii + 105, with 39 plates and one plan] (E. Gerster). Collects results of the first 30 years of excavation and examines them critically in the light of more recent work. Clear, concise, and thorough. Reviewer gives full summary of contents.

COMMUNICATIONS.—20 June, C. Fries, *De deorum volatu* (4 cols.). 27 June, F. Dornseiff, *Kallimachos' Hymnos auf Artemis* (3 cols.). 4 July, W. Schmid, *Zwei Auflagen von Euripides' Αἰνείδης* (1½ cols.). 18 July, A. Kraemer, *De Sallusti bell. Jug.* 78, 2 (3 cols.). 25 July, A. Kraemer, *De bibliothecae Moenofrancofurtensis inscriptione* (3 cols.). 1 Aug., A. Schwarz, *Das Rätsel der Komödientitel 'Asinaria' und 'Rudens'* (3½ cols.). 8 Aug., P. Merlan, *Überflüssige Textänderungen* (3 cols.).

GNOMON.

XII. 9. (SEPTEMBER, 1936.)

(1) E. Cahen: *Callimaque et son œuvre poétique* [C.R. XLVI, 163]; (2) E. Cahen: *Les hymnes de Callimaque* [Paris: de Boccard, 1930. Pp. xi + 282]; (3) A. Couat: *Alexandrian Poetry* [C.R. XLVI, 163] (Herter). H. cannot agree with Cahen's estimate of Callimachus, but much of (1) is good, particularly the last chapter, and the commentary on the Hymns is welcome. Couat's book, with Cahen's appendix on recent discoveries, was worth reissuing in English. G. Coppola: *Cirène e il nuovo Callimaco* [Bologna: Zanichelli, 1935. Pp. xiv + 242] (Reitzenstein). A stimulating book. Much is uncertain, but R. agrees with many of the conclusions. E. Bignone: *Teocrito. Studio critico* [C.R. XLVIII, 194] (Gallavotti). B.'s main merit is to have illustrated some hitherto ignored or wrongly assessed characteristics of the poet's art. G. Marxer: *Die Sprache des Apollonius Rhodius in ihren Beziehungen zu Homer* [Diss. Zürich, 1935] (Fränkel). Only

trifling objections can be made to this good book on a useful theme. W. Schubart and D. Schäfer: *Spätptolemäische Papyri aus amtlichen Büros des Heracleopolites* [Berlin: Weidmann, 1933. Pp. 181, 1 plate] (Zucker). The papyri are as difficult to interpret as to decipher. The editors display great knowledge clearly and concisely. E. Berneker: *Die Sondergerichtsbarkeit im griechischen Recht Aegyptens* [Munich: Beck, 1935. Pp. vi+195] (Kreller). B. has mastered his material. It is to be hoped that he will soon apply himself to some wider problems in the history of ancient law. H. J. M. Milne: *Greek Shorthand Manuals* [C.R. L. 24] (Mentz). Fundamentally important, though not all the conclusions are acceptable. P. Friedländer: *Die Melodie zu Pindars erstem pythischen Gedicht* [C.R. XLIX. 62] (Wagner). The book does not establish the authenticity of the music, but it cannot be read without profit. C. M. Smerlenko and G. N. Belknap: *Studies in Greek Religion* [C.R. L. 202] (Nilsson). Five useful studies, the two on Dionysos being important contributions. M. Tierney: *The Parodos in Aristophanes' Frogs* [C.R. XLIX. 203] (Deubner). D. is in complete disagreement with T.'s theory. C. Blum: *Studies in the Dream-Book of Artemidorus* [C.R. L. 2] (Rose). Better on the linguistic side than on the philosophical background. *Het Testimoniabook*. Studies by N. J. Hommes [Amsterdam, 1935. Pp. viii+394] (Souter). A detailed examination of some of Rendel Harris's interesting hypotheses, which cannot be ignored by students of the subject. G. Baumecker: *Winckelmann in seinen Dresdner Schriften*, 1933 (Müller); K. Krauss: *Winckelmann und Homer*, 1936 (Scheffold) [both published by Junker und Dünhaupt of Berlin].

XII. 10. (OCTOBER, 1936.)

F. Altheim: *Epochen der römischen Geschichte*, vol. 2 [C.R. L. 90] (Vogt). This volume does not fulfil the hopes raised by the first. A. expresses himself attractively, but he fails to perceive the ultimate connection of historical events. (1) W. Theiler: *Porphyrios und Augustin* [C.R. XLIX. 71]; (2) J. Guittou: *Le Temps et l'Éternité chez Plotin et Saint-Augustin* [Paris: Boivin, 1933. Pp. xxiv+397]; (3) P. Henry, S.J.: *Plotin et l'Occident* [C.R. XLIX. 179]; (4) J. Barion: *Plotin und Augustinus* [Berlin: Junker und Dünhaupt, 1935. Pp. 175] (Merlan). (1) Th. perhaps overestimates the influence of Porphyry on Augustine, but he throws much new light on the Neo-Platonism of the latter. (2) G. writes in a lively and attractive way, but he oversimplifies the problems. (3) H.'s theories are not all new, but he supplies new and better evidence for such theories as he adopts. (4) B.'s conclusions are similar to those of Henry, but his book is vague. P. Henry: *Recherches...* [C.R. L. 128] (Schwyzer). Very valuable as preliminary to an edition of Plotinus. Scholars will look forward to his next book, *Les états du texte de Plotin*. St. von Stepski Doliwa: *Studien zur Syntax des byzantinischen Historikers Georgios Phrantzes* [Munich:

Salesianische Offizin, 1935. Pp. xii+283] (Schwyzer). A useful contribution to the history of the Greek language, though not all the views are acceptable. F. Birkner: *Ur- und Vorzeit Bayerns* [Munich: Knorr und Hirth, 1936. Pp. 215, illustrated] (Zeiss). A reliable guide to the complicated history of Bavaria. R. Heuberger: *Das Burggrafenamt im Altertum* [Innsbruck: Universitäts-Verlag Wagner, 1935. Pp. viii+112, 2 plates] (Goessler). Useful and interesting. L. M. Lanckoroński: *Schönes Geld der alten Welt* [Munich: E. Heimeran, 1935. Pp. 99, 40 full-page illustrations] (Lippold). A good selection with explanatory notes designed and suitable for the general reader. E. Ziebarth: *Neue Verfluchungstafeln aus Attika, Boiotien und Euböia* [Berlin: de Gruyter, 1934. Pp. 31, 3 plates (SBBerl. Phil. hist. Kl. 1934, 33)] (Eitrem). The texts are not always well restored, but there is much to be learnt from the book. M. Hofmann: *Antike Briefe* [Munich: Heimeran, 1935. Pp. 144] (Kortenbeutel). Spoilt by misprints, but very welcome.—Bibliographical Supplement, 1936, Nr. 5 (down to September 30).

CLASSICAL WEEKLY.

VOL. XXX. NOS. 1-3. OCTOBER, 1936.

C. J. Kraemer, Jr., *From the Editor*. E. Riess, *Charles Knapp* (1868-1936): *Iustum et tenacem propositi virum*. W. K. Prentice, *The Study of the Classics*. On aims and methods in classical teaching: reading should be widened by much use of translations. W. A. Oldfather, *Last Words on the Rising of Cold. Problemata* 23. 34 and Epictetus IV. 8. 39 are based on actual observation of the normal coolness of earth and the things that issue therefrom.

REVIEWS.—B. A. Van Groningen, *Aristote: Le second livre de l'Économique*, Leyden, Sijthoff, 1933. Favourable (M. L. W. Laistner). W. D. Ross, *Aristotle's Physics*, Oxford, 1936. Really the first complete modern edition in any language: the text is conspicuously superior to any other: more might have been said on A.'s scientific position (I. E. Drabkin). G. R. Morrow, *Studies in the Platonic Epistles*, Univ. of Illinois, 1925. Thoroughly sound and in many respects extremely valuable (W. J. Oates). *Greek Poetry and Life* (Essays presented to Gilbert Murray), Oxford, 1936. Valuable, even if full of unproved hypotheses (D. M. Robinson). T. Frank, *An Economic Survey of Ancient Rome. Vol. 1. Rome and Italy of the Republic*, Baltimore, 1933. Admirable for its clarity, rational organization, and conservative balance: some opinions too conservative (A. A. Trever). M. Hammond, *The Augustan Principle in Theory and Practice during the Julio-Claudian Period*, Harvard, 1933. Assumes and never proves that Augustus sincerely desired to preserve the res publica restituta (M. Reinhold). *The Cambridge Ancient History, Vol. X.: The Augustan Empire 44 B.C.—A.D. 70, and vol. of plates IV*, 1934. It is perhaps to be regretted that the scholarship does not

present a more international breadth and weight (M. Hammond). W. C. Greene, *The Achievement of Rome, a Chapter in Civilization*, Harvard, 1933. Favourable (A. P. McKinlay). *Transactions and Proceedings of the American Philological Association*, ed. L. A. Post, Vol. LXVI, Haverford, 1935. List of contents (F. A. Spencer). J. R. Watmough, *Orphism*, Cambridge, 1934. An interesting but unconvincing moral interpretation (E. Riess). R. Boehringer, *Platon, Bildniss und Nachweise*, Breslau, 1935. Favourable (Margarete Bieber). R. J. H. Jenkins, *Dedolica: a Study of Dorian Plastic*

Art in the Seventh Century B.C., Cambridge, 1936. An essay well worth making (A. D. Fraser). D. C. Wilkinson, *Greek Sculpture*, New York: Oxford Univ. Press, 1936. Severely criticized by W. R. Agard. *Greek Ostraca in the University of Michigan Collection. Part I*, Ann Arbor, 1935. Very careful and scholarly (C. W. Keyes). Elizabeth Grier, *Accounting in the Zenon Papyri*, Columbia Univ. Press, 1934. Favourable (H. C. Youtie). Ellen W. Moore, *Neo-Babylonian Business and Administrative Documents*, Ann Arbor, 1935. Favourable (R. Marcus).

BOOKS RECEIVED

All publications which have a bearing on classical studies will be entered in this list if they are sent for review. The price should in all cases be stated.

*. * Excerpts or extracts from periodicals and collections will not be included unless they are also published separately.

- Axelsson** (B.) Zum Alexanderroman des Iulius Valerius. Pp. 32. (Bulletin de la Société Royale des Lettres de Lund 1935-1936, III.) Lund: Gleerup (London: Milford), 1936. Paper, 1s. 6d.
- Broadhead** (H. D.) Exules Siberiani. (An abridged Latin version of 'La jeune Sibérienne'.) Pp. 47. Auckland etc. and London: Whitcombe and Tombs. Paper.
- Cavallin** (S.) Zum Bedeutungswandel von lat. *unde* und *inde*. Eine neue Handschrift der Vita Caesarii Arelatensis. Pp. 20. (Bulletin de la Société Royale des Lettres de Lund 1935-1936, I, II.) Lund: Gleerup (London: Milford), 1936. Paper, 1s. 6d.
- Ewbank** (W. W.) First Year Latin. Pp. xviii + 235; illustrations. London: Longmans, 1936. Cloth, 2s. 9d.
- Fuchs** (J. W.) Index Verborum in Ciceronis de Inventione Libros II. Pars prior. Pp. xviii + 82. The Hague: printed by van Scherpenzeel, 1936. Paper.
- Gow** (A. S. F.) A. E. Housman. A sketch, together with a list of his writings and an index to his classical papers. Pp. xiii + 137; 3 illustrations. Cambridge: University Press, 1936. Cloth, 7s. 6d.
- Hardie** (W. F. R.) A study in Plato. Pp. xiii + 172. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1936. Cloth, 8s. 6d.
- Hornsby** (H. M.) A. Gellii Noctium Atticarum Liber I. Edited with introduction and notes. Pp. lxvi + 227. Dublin: Hodges, Figgis (London: Longmans), 1936. Cloth.
- Illustrated Regional Guides to Ancient Monuments* under the ownership or guardianship of H.M. Office of Works. Vol. III. England: East Anglia and Midlands, by W. Ormsby Gore. Pp. 72; 20 illustrations, 1 map. London: H.M. Stationery Office, 1936. Cloth, 1s. (postage extra).
- Kean** (M.) Penultima Latina. A Latin Companion for Middle Forms. Pp. viii + 108. London and Glasgow: Blackie, 1936. Cloth, 1s. 3d.
- Löfstedt** (E.) Vermischte Studien zur lateinischen Sprachkunde und Syntax. Pp. xiii + 232. (Skrifter utgivna av Kungl. Humanistiska Vetenskapssamfundet i Lund. XXIII.) Lund: Gleerup (London: Milford), 1936. Paper, 10s. 6d.
- MacKenna** (S.) Journals and Letters. Edited with a Memoir by E. R. Dodds. Pp. xvi + 330; 4 illustrations. London: Constable, 1936. Cloth, 18s.
- MacNeice** (L.) The Agamemnon of Aeschylus translated. Pp. 71. London: Faber and Faber, 1936. Cloth, 5s.
- Méautis** (G.) Eschyle et la Trilogie. Pp. 285. Paris: Grasset, 1936. Paper, 25 fr.
- Powell** (J. E.) A list of printed catalogues of Greek manuscripts in Italy. Pp. 14. London: Bibliographical Society, 1936. Paper. (Copies may be had free from the author at Trinity College, Cambridge.)
- Read** (J.) Prelude to Chemistry. An outline of Alchemy, its literature and relationships. Pp. xxiv + 328; 64 plates. London: Bell, 1936. Cloth, 12s. 6d.
- Rose** (H. J.) A Handbook of Latin Literature from the Earliest Times to the Death of St. Augustine. Pp. ix + 557. London: Methuen, 1936. Cloth, 21s.
- Schwartz** (E.) Kaiser Constantin und die christliche Kirche. Fünf Vorträge. Zweite Auflage. Pp. viii + 160; 1 photograph. Leipzig and Berlin: Teubner, 1936. Cloth, (export price) RM. 6.
- The Cambridge Ancient History*. Vol. XI. The Imperial Peace, A.D. 70-192. Pp. xxvii + 997; maps, plans, tables, etc. Cambridge: University Press, 1936. Cloth, 35s.
- Vellay** (C.) Controverses autour de Troie. Pp. 177; illustrations. (Collection d'Etudes Anciennes.) Paris: 'Les Belles Lettres', 1936. Paper.
- von Blumenthal** (A.) Sophokles. Entstehung und Vollendung der griechischen Tragödie. Pp. 284. Stuttgart: Kohlhammer, 1936. Inland prices: paper, RM. 10; bound, 12.
- Woody** (T.) Philostratus: Concerning Gymnastics. Pp. 30. (Reprinted from The Research Quarterly, 1936, VII, 2.) Ann Arbor, Mich.: American Physical Education Association. Paper, 50 cents.

INDEX

I.—GENERAL INDEX.

- Aeschylus, a Phocism in, 11
Aeschylus' Supplices, *Ἀλκν* and *Ἰσπιν* in, 104
Africa Romana, 142
Alexander (W. H.) Note on 'in morbo consumat,' 121
Alfieri's Gli Atomisti, 124
Allan (D. J.) on Tredennick and Armstrong's Aristototele, *Metaphysics (X-XIV)*, *Oeconomica* and *Magna Moralia*, 36. On Strohm's *Untersuchungen zur Entwicklungsgeschichte der aristotelischen Metazologie*, 37. On Diès' Budé text of Plato's *Politics*, 61. On Gohlke's *Die Entstehung der Aristotelischen Logik*, 177. On Kuhn's *Sokrates: ein Versuch über den Ursprung der Metaphysik*, 199. On Antweiler's *Der Begriff der Wissenschaft bei Aristoteles*, 199
Allen, Halliday, and Sikes' *The Homeric Hymns*, 217
Altheim's *Weltherrschaft und Krise*, 90
Aly's *Luivius und Ennius*, 202
American Academy in Rome, *Memoirs of (XII)*, 43
American Philological Association, *Transactions and Proceedings of (LXIV, LXV)*, 84
amurca, 131
Anderson's The Argument of Plato, 63
An Examination of Examinations, 2
Antweiler's *Der Begriff der Wissenschaft bei Aristoteles*, 199
aqua, 91
Arelas, 9
argentus, 215
Ashby's *The Aqueducts of Ancient Rome*, 34, 91
Ashmole (B.) on Fyfe's *Hellenistic Architecture*, 189.
On Jenkins' *Dedalia*, 233
Ashmole's Late Archaic and Early Classical Greek Sculpture in Sicily and South Italy, 188
asphodel, 101
atheism. Greek for, 3
Atkinson (D.) on Macdonald's *The Roman Wall in Scotland*, 79
augurior, 9
Austin (R. G.) on Ramsay's *Frondes Salicis*, 84. On Symon's *Thanks to Vergil*, 89. On Goldschmidt's Burchardus de Bellevaux, *Apologia de Barbis*, 90. On Sikes' *Lucretius Poet and Philosopher*, 132. On Knoche's *Magnitudo Animi*, 180. On Fairclough's revised edition of Virgil (I), 239
Bachtin's *Introduction to the Study of Modern Greek*, 81
Bailey (C.) on Hadzist's *Lucretius and his Influence*, 37
Bailey (K. C.) on Forbes' *Bitumen and Petroleum in Antiquity*, 243
Baldry (H. C.) on Diels-Kranz's *Die Fragmente der Vorsokratiker*, 19
Barber's *The Historian Ephorus*, 64
Basore's *Seneca, Moral Essays (III)*, 133
Beare (W.) on Ernout's Budé text of Plautus (IV), 223. On Harsh's *Studies in Dramatic 'Preparation' in Roman Comedy*, 238
Bell (H. I.) on Reinmuth's *The Prefect of Egypt from Augustus to Diocletian*, 41. On *Études de Papyrologie (II. 2)*, 90. On Goodspeed and Colwell's *A Greek Papyrus Reader*, 148. On Johnson's *Roman Egypt to the Reign of Diocletian*, 195. On Mayser's *Grammatik der griechischen Papyri aus der Ptolemäerzeit (Band I, III. Teil)*, 201. On *Études de Papyrologie (III)*, 202. On Boak's *Sohnopaiou Nesos*, 204. On Skeat and Visiak's *Milton's Lament for Damon and his other Latin Poems*, 204
Bethe's *Ahnenbild und Familiengeschichte bei Römern und Griechen*, 243
Bibliography on the Survival of the Classics (I), 43
Bibliotheca Philologica Classica (1934), 161
Bibliotheca Scriptorum Medii Recentisque Aevorum, 182
bigatus, 216
Birley's *Corbridge Roman Station (Corstopitum)*, 40
Biscardi's *Il dogma della collisione alla luce del diritto romano*, 152
Blakeney's *Musaeus: Hero and Leander*, 19
Bloch and Carcopino's *La république romaine de 133 à 44 avant J.-C.*, 135
Blom's *De typische Getallen bij Homeros en Herodotos (I)*, 172
Blum's *Studies in the Dream-Book of Artemidorus*, 200
Boak's *Sohnopaiou Nesos*, 204
Bonazzi's *Catulli Carmina*, 238
Bonner's *Aspects of Athenian Democracy*, 31
BOOKS RECEIVED, 47, 94, 157, 207, 246
Bornecque's *Tite-Live*, 72
Botschuyver's *Scholias in Horatium*, 150
Boulenger's *Saint Basile aux Jeunes Gens*, 37
Bowra (C. M.) on van der Valk's *Beiträge zur Nehyia*, 146
Bowra's *Pindari Carmina cum fragmentis*, 14; his *Greek Lyric Poetry*, 168
Boyd (M. J.) on Bréhier's Plotin: *Ennéades VI (1re partie)*, 200. On Wetmore's *Seneca's conception of the Stoic Sage*, 240
Bozzi's *Ideali e correnti letterarie nell' Eneide*, 88
Braune's *Nonnos und Ovid*, 239
Bréhier's Plotin: *Ennéades VI (1re partie)*, 200
British School at Athens, Jubilee Exhibition of, 209
British School at Rome: *Papers (XIII)*, 50
Broadhead (H. D.) on Knook's *De overgang van metrisch tot rythmisch proza bij Cyprianus en Hieronymus*, 151
Brogan (O. P. F.) on a Map of Gaul to illustrate Caesar's Campaigns, 204
Browne (R. A.) An emendation of Leonidas of Tarentum, 167
Burck's *Die Erzählungskunst des T. Livius*, 72
Bury's *Sextus Empiricus (III)*, 200
Cadiou's *La jeunesse d'Origène*, 178
caesura, 66
Calder (W. M.) on Boulenger's *Saint Basile aux Jeunes Gens*, 37. On Hallard's *Idylls of the Tweed*, 152.
Two Phrygian Epitaphs, 214
Callias, wealth of, 55
Calpe, 9
Cambridge performance of Aristophanes' *Frogs*, 1, 49
Campbell (A. H.) on Coster's *The Iudicium Quinquaviale*, 152
Campbell (A. Y.) The opening period of the Agamemnon, 51
Campbell (D. J.) The birthplace of Silius Italicus, 56
Campbell (I. M.) Note on Juvenal i 155-6: 122
Cary (M.) *Καλλίας ὁ Λακκόβλουρος*, 55. On Barber's *The Historian Ephorus*, 64. On Altheim's *Weltherrschaft und Krise*, 90. On Bloch and Carcopino's *La république romaine de 133 à 44 avant J.-C.*, 135. Direction-posts on Roman Roads, 166. On Lanzani's *Lucio Cornelio Silla Dittatore*, 193. On Glotz and Cohen's *Histoire Grecque (III)*, 230
Cary's edition of Tozer's *A History of Ancient Geography*, 42; his *A History of Rome down to the Reign of Constantine*, 140
caudeus, 9
Cesareo's *De Statii duabus silvis*, 38; his *Il Panegirico nella Poesia latina*, 240
Chaplin's *Latin Unseens*, 87
Chapman (R. W.) Note on Plato *Republic 369D*: 167
chalidon, 9
Christie (J. T.) on Giusti's *Antologia Omerica (Odissea)*, 36. On some Class-Books, 87, 235
ciccus, 9
Classical Association, meetings of, 1, 209
Classical Association of Scotland, meetings of, 1, 209
Classical Weekly, remarks on, 209; summarized, 46, 92, 156, 245
Clayton (F.) Note on Pindar N. ix 32: 5
Cobban's *Senate and Provinces, 78-49 B.C.*: 33
'cock' in Latin, 164
coinages at Rome, 215
'collision', 152
Colson's *Philo (VI)*, 148
Commentationes Vindobonenses, 161
Constans' Budé text of Cicero's *Letters (II)*, 71
Cornford's *Plato's Theory of Knowledge*, 21

- Coster's *The Iudicium Quinquavirale*, 152
 Costil's *André Dudith*, 152
 Craig (J. D.) on Stella's *Cyrena*, 224
 Creed (J. M.) on Harris' *The After-Glow Essays* (no. 12), 88
 Cripps (R.) Note on Aeschylus *Ag.* 14: 60
crocus sativus, 100
 Croft's *Revision Exercises in Latin Syntax*, 235
 Cronin's *The Athenian Juvor and his Oath*, 151
cuiuscemodi, 10
 Dale (A. M.) on Tucker's translations of Aeschylus, Agamemnon and Prometheus Bound, 16. On Untersteiner's *Sofocle: Studio critico*, 68. On Tucker's translation of Aeschylus, *Persae*, 171
 dative of the agent in Horace's *Odes*, 118
 Davies' *Roman Mines in Europe*, 143
 Dawkins (R. M.) on Bachtin's *Introduction to the Study of Modern Greek*, 81. On von Haxthausen, Kemminghausen, and Soyter's *Neugriechische Volkslieder*, 82. On Papadopoulos' *Phrantzes, Chronicon* (I), 149
 Dawkins' *The Monks of Athes*, 196
decennalia, 10
 de Groot's *Wesen und Gesetze der Caesar*, 66
 Deichgräber's *Hippocrates περί σαρκῶν*, 62
de integro, 165
 de Jong's *Apologetiek en Christendom in den Octavius van Minucius Felix*, 39
 de Jonge's *Sprachlicher und historischer Kommentar zu Ammianus Marcellinus xiv. 1-7: 150*
denarius nummus, 215 f.
 Denniston (J. D.) Notes on Aeschylus, Euripides, Sophocles, and Aristophanes, 115. On Forster and Webster's *An Anthology of Greek Verse*, 197
 de Saint-Denis' *Le rôle de la mer dans la poésie latine*, 179
 de Vogel's *Ein Keerpunt in Plato's Denken*, 220
devotiones, 214
 de Zulueta (F.) on Diamond's *Primitive Law*, 78
 Diamond's *Primitive Law*, 78
 Diels-Kranz's *Die Fragmente der Vorsokratiker*, 19
 Dies' Budé text of Plato's *Politics*, 61
Δίκη and *Τῆπος* in Aeschylus' *Supplices*, 104
 Dodds (E. R.) on Henry's *Recherches sur la Préparation Évangélique d'Eusèbe et l'édition perdue des œuvres de Plotin publiée par Eustochius*, 128
 Duff (A. M.) on de Saint-Denis' *Le rôle de la mer dans la poésie latine*, 179. On Cesareo's *Il Panegirico nella Poesia latina*, 240
 Duff (J. F.) on Valentine's *Latin: its Place and Value in Education*, 12
 Duff (P. W.) on Biscardi's *Il dogma della collisione alla luce del diritto romano*, 152
 Duff's *Silius Italicus, Punica*, 75
 Dumortier's *Les images dans la poésie d'Eschyle et Le vocabulaire médical d'Eschyle et des écrits hippocratiques*, 17
 Earp (F. R.) on Livingstone's *Greek Ideals and Modern Life*, 11. On Tucker's *Across the Centuries*, 36. On *Essays in Honour of Gilbert Murray*, 122. On *Greek Poetry and Life*, 122. On Webster's *An Introduction to Sophocles*, 171
 Eberhart's *Mitteilungen aus der Papyrussammlung der Giessener Universitätsbibliothek* (IV), 37
 Edelstein's *Xenophontisches und Platonisches Bild des Sokrates*, 125
 Edmunds (J. M.) on Bowra's *Greek Lyric Poetry*, 168. Verse translation of Semonides of Amorgos ap. *Stob. Flor.* 73 61: 210
Emerita, 161
 Entwistle's *The Spanish Language*, 181
 Eriksson's *Religiositet och irreligiositet hos Tacitus*, 91
 Ernout's Budé text of Plautus (IV), 223
Essays in Honour of Gilbert Murray, 122
Études de Papyrologie (II, 2), 90; (III), 202
 Euboea and Samos in the Delian Confederacy, 6
 Evelyn's *Agrippina*, 41
extorris, 165
 Eyre's *European Civilization, its Origin and Development* (I and II), 29
 Fairclough's revised edition of Virgil (I), 239
 Field (G. C.) on Cornford's *Plato's Theory of Knowledge*, 21. On Anderson's *The Argument of Plato*, 63. On Grube's *Plato's Thought*, 63
 Filippi's Italian translation of Schwartz's *Charakterhöffe aus der antiken Literatur*, 237
 Fletcher (G. B. A.) on Spencer's *Celsus, de Medicina* (I), 27. On Basore's *Seneca, Moral Essays* (III), 133. On de Jonge's *Sprachlicher und historischer Kommentar zu Ammianus Marcellinus XIV. 1-7: 150*. More Notes on Lewis and Short, 165. On Braune's *Nonnos und Ovid*, 239
 Flickinger's *The 'Aupria of Sophocles' Antigone*, 198
fluvia, 10
 Forbes' *Bitumen and Petroleum in Antiquity*, 243
 Fordyce (C. J.) on Cesareo's *De Statii duabus silvis*, 38. On Kappelmacher and Schuster's *Die Literatur der Römer bis zur Karolingerzeit*, 69. On Till's *Die Sprache Catos*, 131. On Pease's *P. Vergili Maronis Aeneidos liber quartus*, 226 f. On Bonazzi's *Catulli Carmina*, 238
 Forster (E. S.) Trees and plants in Homer, 97 ff. On Mazon's *Madame Dacier et les traductions d'Homère en France*, 198. On Hett's *Aristotle: Minor Works*, 221. On Van Gundy's translation of Horace's *Odes*, 225
 Forster and Webster's *An Anthology of Greek Verse*, 197
 Fortgens' *P. Papinii Statii de Opheltis funere carmen epicum*, 76
 Funaoli's *Horaz als Mensch und Dichter*, 239
 Fyfe's *Hellenistic Architecture*, 189
 Gadamer's *Plato und die Dichter*, 147
 Galli's *Platone: Il Simposio*, 198
gallus, 164
 Gaselee (S.) on Blakeney's *Musaeus: Hero and Leander*, 19. On Rattenbury, Lumb, and Maillon's *Heliodorus* (I), 65. On Russell and Heironimus' *The Shorter Latin Poems of Master Henry of Avranches relating to England*, 83. On Rackham's *This Way and That*, 83. On *Carmina Hoenftiana*, 83. On Müller's *Die Epigramme des Antiphilos von Byzanz*, 129. On Entwistle's *The Spanish Language*, 181. On *Bibliotheca Scriptorum Medii Recentisque Aevorum*, 182. On Lewis' *The Allegory of Love*, 183. On Watson's Latin version of *The Hunting of the Snark*, 183. On Marmorale's *Petronio*, 227
 genitive case with *διά* (dial), 162
 Gerth's *Lateinische Syntax*, 235
 Getty (R. J.) on Schulte's *Index Verborum Valerianus*, 89
 Gilles (A. F.) on Glover's *The Ancient World*, 28. On Eyre's *European Civilization, its Origin and Development* (I and II), 29. On Cary's *A History of Rome down to the Reign of Constantine*, 140. On Robinson's *A Short History of Greece*, 229
 Gillies (M. M.) on Schütze's *Beiträge zum Verständnis der Phainomena Arats*, 88
 Giusti's *Antologia Omica* (Odyssey), 36
 Glotz and Cohen's *Histoire Grecque* (III), 230
 Glover's *The Ancient World*, 28
Gnomon summarized, 44, 92, 153, 205, 244
 Gohlke's *Die Entstehung der Aristotelischen Logik*, 177
 Goldschmidt's *Burchardus de Bellevaux, Apologia de Barbis*, 90
 Gomme (A. W.) Euboea and Samos in the Delian Confederacy, 6. On Lovejoy, Boas, Allright, and Dumont's *Primitivism and Related Ideas in Antiquity*, 77. On Cronin's *The Athenian Juvor and his Oath*, 151. On Willich's *Perikles*, 191. On Vlachos' *Hellas and Hellenism*, 192. On Harrell's *Public Arbitration in Athenian Law*, 231
 Goodfellow's *Roman Citizenship*, 141
 Goodspeed and Colwell's *A Greek Papyrus Reader*, 148
 Gordon's *Epigraphica* (I), 203
 Gotschich's *Probleme der frühgriechischen Plastik*, 81
Greek Poetry and Life (Essays presented to Gilbert Murray), 122
 Grosskinsky's *Das Programm des Thukydides*, 174
 Grube's *Plato's Thought*, 63
 Guthrie (W. E. C.) on Smertenko and Belknap's *Studies in Greek Religion*, 202
 Hackforth (R.) on Edelstein's *Xenophontisches und Platonisches Bild des Sokrates*, 125
 Hadzits's *Lucretius and his Influence*, 37
 Hallard's *Idylls of the Tweed*, 152
 Hallward (B. L.) on Scullard's *A History of the Roman World from 753 to 146 B.C.: 78*

- Halm - Andresen - Koestermann's Teubner text of Tacitus (II, fasc. i), 180
- Hamilton (W.) on Alfieri's *Gli Atomisti*, 124. On Lee's *Zeno of Elea*, 173
- Hammond (N. G. L.) on Oldfather's *Diodorus Siculus* (II), 148
- Hanell's *Die Inschriftensammlung des Konstantinos Laskaris*, 39
- Harden (D. B.) on Lamb's *Excavations at Thermi in Lesbos*, 232
- Hardie (C. G.) on Van Buren's *Ancient Rome as Revealed by Recent Discoveries*, 190
- Harrell's *Public Arbitration in Athenian Law*, 231
- Harris' *The After-Glow Essays*, no. 12: 88
- Harrison (E.) A Phocism in Aeschylus?, 11. On de Groot's *Wesen und Gesetze der Caesar*, 66. On *L'Année Philologique* (IX), *Harvard Studies in Classical Philology* (XLV), *Yale Classical Studies* (IV), *Symboles Osloenses* (XIII), *Transactions and Proceedings of the American Philological Association* (LXIV, LXV), 84. On Jaeger's *Paideia* (I, 2nd edn.), 87. On Martinelli's translation of Powell and Barber's *New Chapters in the History of Greek Literature*, 88. On Lindskog-Ziegler's *Plutarchi vitae parallelae* (II, fasc. ii) and Nachstadt-Sieveking-Titchener's *Plutarchi Moralia* (II), 127
- Harsh's *Studies in Dramatic 'Preparation' in Roman Comedy*, 238
- Harte (R. H.) Note on Pliny *Epist.* I 4 1: 58
- Harvard *Studies in Classical Philology* (XLV), 84
- Hatch's *The Greek Manuscripts of the New Testament*, 201
- Heick's *The Ab Urbe Condita Construction in Latin*, 237
- Heidel's *Hecataeus and the Egyptian Priests in Herodotus*, Book II: 60
- Hennemann's *Der äussere und innere Stil in Trajans Briefen*, 150
- Henry (B. M.) on Patch's *The Tradition of Boethius*, 203
- Henry's *Recherches sur la Préparation Évangélique d'Éusèbe et l'édition perdue des œuvres de Plotin publiée par Eusèbe*, 128
- Hesperia (IV), 2
- Hett's *Aristotle: Minor Works*, 221
- Heuvel's *P. Papinii Statii Thebaidos liber primus*, 76
- Higham (T. F.) on Moore's *Ovid's Art of Love*, 157
- Highet (G.) on Meyerstein's translation of Propertius, 73
- Hignett (C.) on Heidel's *Hecataeus and the Egyptian Priests in Herodotus*, Book II: 60
- Hinks' *Greek and Roman Portrait Sculpture*, 91
- Hoeufft prize poems, 83; notice to competitors, 162
- Holroyd (M.) on Momigliano's *Filippo il Macedone*, 32
- Homer, Trees and plants in, 97 ff.
- Hooke's *The Labyrinth*, 42
- Housman (A. E.) on Vianello's *D. Iunii Iuvenalis satiras*, 26
- Housman (A. E.) obituary notices of, 50, 113
- Hunt's (A. S.) papyrological library, 50
- hyacinthus, 101
- immunis, 165
- inaugurio, 9
- incentivum, 10
- indoles, 10
- in morbo consumat, 121
- inscriptions. Roman, in Britain, 210
- intertrasque, 10
- Jacob (E. F.) on Moss's *The Birth of the Middle Ages*, 197
- Jaeger's *Paideia* (I, 2nd edition), 87
- Jenkins' *Dedalic*, 233
- Johnson (S. K.) on Bornecque's *Tite-Live*, 72. On Burk's *Die Erzählungskunst des T. Livius*, 72. On Aly's *Livius und Ennius*, 202
- Johnson's *Roman Egypt to the Reign of Diocletian*, 195
- Johnston's *Map of Gaul to Illustrate Caesar's Campaigns*, 204
- Joseph's *Essays in Ancient and Modern Philosophy*, 220
- Jost's *Das Beispiel und Vorbild der Vorfahren bei den attischen Rednern und Geschichtsschreibern bis Demosthenes*, 177
- Juvenal and Virgil, 122
- Kapaukagias' *Ἡ ἀρχαία Ῥωμαία*, 40
- Kappelmacher and Schuster's *Die Literatur der Römer bis zur Karolingerzeit*, 69
- Keenan's *The Life and Times of St. Augustine as Revealed in His Letters*, 39
- Kitto (H. D. F.) on Winnington-Ingram's *Mode in Ancient Greek Music*, 184. On Dawkins' *The Monks of Athos*, 196. On Robinson's *Pindar, a Poet of Eternal Ideas*, 237.
- Kleist's *The Gospel of Saint Mark*, 149
- Knapp (Charles), 209
- Knoche's *Magnitudo Animi*, 180
- Knook's *De overgang van metrisch tot rythmisch proza bij Cyprianus en Hieronymus*, 151
- Knox (T. M.) on Joseph's *Essays in Ancient and Modern Philosophy*, 220
- Kolbe's *Die Weltreichsidee Alexanders des Grossen*, 242
- Kornemann's *Die Alexandergeschichte des Königs Ptolemaios I von Aegypten*, 137
- Kruse's *Studien zur offiziellen Geltung des Kaiserbildes im römischen Reiche*, 41
- Kuhn's *Sokrates: ein Versuch über den Ursprung der Metaphysik*, 199
- Laidlaw (W. A.) Note on *tam magnus*, 11
- Laidlaw's *A History of Delos*, 30
- Laistner (M. L. W.) on Leuze's *Die Satrapieneinteilung in Syrien und im Zweistromlande von 520-320*: 40
- Lake's *Monumenta Palaeographica Vetera*, 1st series, fasc. III and IV: 80
- lama, 161
- Lamb's *Excavations at Thermi in Lesbos*, 232
- L'Année Philologique* (IX), 84
- L'Antiquité Classique*, 49
- Lanzani's *Lucio Cornelio Silla Dittatore*, 193
- Latin Teaching: Commemoration Number, 1911-1936: 235
- Laurand's *Études sur le style des discours de Cicéron*, 4th edn. (I), 202
- Lawrence (A. W.) on Gotsmich's *Probleme der früh-griechischen Plastik*, 81. On Wilkinson's *Greek Sculpture*, 186. On Picard's *Manuel d'Archéologie Grecque: La Sculpture* (I), 187. On Ashmole's *Late Archaic and Early Classical Greek Sculpture in Sicily and South Italy*, 188
- Lee's *Zeno of Elea*, 173
- Les Études Classiques*, 49, 161
- Leuze's *Die Satrapieneinteilung in Syrien und im Zweistromlande von 520-320*: 40
- Levy's *The Inveective in Rufinus of Claudius Claudianus*, 228
- Lewis' *The Allegory of Love*, 183
- Lewis and Short, Notes on, 9, 165
- Liedmeier's *Plutarchus' Biographie von Aemilius Paulus*, 139
- Lind's *What Rome has left us*, 91
- Lindsay's *The Romans*, 40
- Lindskog-Ziegler's *Plutarchi vitae parallelae* (II, fasc. ii), 127
- Livingstone (B. W.) on Lind's *What Rome has left us*, 91
- Livingstone's *Greek Ideals and Modern Life*, 11
- Livy, projected Thesaurus of, 210
- Lorimer (H. L.) on Valmin's *Die Zeus-Stoa in der Agora von Athen und Rapport préliminaire de l'expédition en Messénie*, 1933, 1934: 39
- Lorimer (W. L.) Note on Plato *Theaetetus* 175b: 60.
- On Costil's *André Dudith*, 152
- lotus, 100
- Lovejoy, Boas, Allright, and Dumont's *Primitivism and Related Ideas in Antiquity*, 77
- Lowe's *Codices Latini Antiquiores*, part II: 146
- McDonald (A. H.) on Seel's *Hirtius*, 133
- Macdonald (G.) on Robinson's *Sylloge Nummorum Graecorum* (II, v-vi), 144: (I, ii), 242
- Macdonald's *The Roman Wall in Scotland*, 79
- Macgregor (D. C.) on Bonner's *Aspects of Athenian Democracy*, 31
- McKenzie (B.) A rare imperative form, 60. On Werres' *Die Beteuerungsformeln in der attischen Komödie*, 199
- magnitudo animi*, 180
- Maguinness (W. S.) Notes on Lewis and Short, 9
- Maidment (E. J.) on Jost's *Das Beispiel und Vorbild der Vorfahren bei den attischen Rednern und Geschichtsschreibern bis Demosthenes*, 177
- Manson (T. W.) on Kleist's *The Gospel of Saint Mark*, 149
- Map of Gaul to Illustrate Caesar's Campaigns, 204
- Marchant (E. C.) on Sörbom's *Variatio sermonis*

- Tacitei*, 73. On Eriksson's *Religiositet och irreligiositet hos Tacitus*, 91. On Robinson's *The Germania of Tacitus*, 134. On Halm-Andresen-Koestermann's Teubner text of Tacitus (II, fasc. i), 180. On Marsh and Leon's Tacitus: *Selections from his Works*, 240
- Marchant's *A New Latin Reader*, 235
- Marmorale's *Petronio*, 227
- Marouzeau's *Traité de Stylistique appliquée au latin*, 70
- Marsh and Leon's Tacitus: *Selections from his Works*, 240
- Martinelli's translation of Powell and Barber's *New Chapters in the History of Greek Literature*, 88
- Mattingly (H.) on Kapnakagias' *Ἡ ἀρχαία Πρωτάλη*, 40
- Mayser's *Grammatik der griechischen Papyri aus der Ptolemäerzeit* (Band I, III. Teil), 201
- Mazon's *Madame Dacier et les traductions d'Homère en France*, 198
- Meecham's *The Letter of Aristeas*, 88
- Meiggs (E.) on Rogers, Scott, and Ward's *Caesaris Augusti Res Gestae et Fragmenta*, 38. On Goodfellow's *Roman Citizenship*, 141
- Meyerstein's translation of Propertius, 73
- Milne (H. J. M.) on Eberhart's *Mitteilungen aus der Papyrusammlung der Giessener Universitätsbibliothek* (IV.), 37
- Milne (J. G.) Pliny on the first coinages at Rome, 215 ff.
- Milne's *Greek Shorthand Manuals* (Syllabary and Commentary), 24
- minium, 55
- Minns (E. H.) on Lake's *Monumenta Palaeographica Vetera*, 1st series, fasc. iii and iv: 80. On Lowe's *Codices Latini Antiquiores*, part II: 146
- moly, 101
- Momigliano's *Filippo il Macedone*, 32
- month-dates in Attic, 2
- Moore (B. P.) on his *Ovid's Art of Love*, 43 (cf. 157)
- morbus, 121
- Morrow's *Studies in the Platonic Epistles*, 22
- Moss's *The Birth of the Middle Ages*, 197
- Müller's *Die Epigramme des Antiphilos von Byzanz*, 129
- Murray (G.) on Shewan's *Homeric Essays*, 13
- Murray (G.) *Essays in Honour of*, 122
- Museaus, date of, 19
- Nachstadt-Sieveling-Titchener's *Plutarchi Moralia* (II), 127
- Nap's *Die römische Republik um das J. 225 v. Chr.*: 138
- Nicholson's *A Handy First Year Latin Book*, 87
- Nicklin's *The Suppliant Women of Euripides*, 87
- Nisbet (R. G.) on Laurand's *Études sur le style des discours de Cicéron*, 4th edn. (I), 202. On Heick's *The Ab Urbe Condita Construction in Latin*, 237
- Noek (A. D.) on Colson's *Philo* (VI), 148
- Northumberland and Durham Branch of the Classical Association: *Third Record of Proceedings*, 162
- Numismatic Congress in London, 1
- numismatics, Roman, 215 ff.
- Oldfather's *Diodorus Siculus* (II), 148
- Ormerod (H. A.) on Laidlaw's *A History of Delos*, 30
- Ormsby Gore's *Illustrated Regional Guides to Ancient Monuments* (II), 204
- Owen (A. S.) on Schädewaldt's *Sophokles und Athen*, 147
- Page (B. S.) on Cadiou's *La jeunesse d'Origène*, 178
- Page (D. L.) on Dumortier's *Les images dans la poésie d'Eschyle*, 17. On Dumortier's *Le vocabulaire médical d'Eschyle et des écrits hippocratiques*, 17
- Page (T. E.), *humanitas* of, 50
- Palmer (L. R.) on Semenov's *The Greek Language in its Evolution*, 183
- Papadopoulos' *Phrantzes, Chronicon* (I), 149
- Parker's *A History of the Roman World*, (A.D. 138-337), 194
- Patch's *The Tradition of Boethius*, 203
- pavio, 10
- Pease's P. *Vergili Maronis Aeneidos liber quartus*, 226
- Peck (A. L.) on Deichgräber's *Hippocrates νεπὶ σκεπτικῶν*, 62
- Pettazzoni's *La Confessione dei Peccati*, 145
- Philologische Wochenschrift summarized, 45, 93, 155, 206, 243
- Phrygian epitaphs, 214
- Picard's *Manuel d'Archéologie Grecque: La Sculpture* (I), 187
- Pickard-Cambridge (A. W.) on Stumpo's *Le Origini della Tragedia*, 18. On Vince's *Demosthenes* (II), 175. On Tierney's *Aristotle and Menander*, 199
- pietas, 194
- pius, 194
- placenta, 131
- Porson's Law, 67
- Post (L. A.): letter on his *Vatican Plato*, 43
- Powell (J. E.) Note on Josephus *Ant. Jud.* xviii 6 5 172: 11. The Manuscript A of Thucydides, 117. On Grosskinsky's *Das Programm des Thukydides*, 174. On Revilla's *Catálogo de los Códices Griegos de la Biblioteca de el Escorial* (I), 236
- Powell and Barber's *New Chapters in the History of Greek Literature* (Martinelli's translation), 88
- Purdie's *Latin Verse Inscriptions*, 27
- quadrigatus, 216
- quaistor sacri palatii, 141
- quality of *ἑξῆς* in words, 109
- Rackham's *Aristotle, The Athenian Constitution, The Eudæmian Ethics, On Virtues and Vices*, 22; his *This Way and That*, 83
- Ramsay's *Frondes Salicis*, 84
- Rattenbury, Lumb, and Maillon's *Budé text of Heliodorus* (I), 65
- Reinmuth's *The Prefect of Egypt from Augustus to Diocletian*, 41
- Revilla's *Catálogo de los Códices Griegos de la Biblioteca de el Escorial* (I), 236
- Richardson (L. J. D.) The dative of the agent in Horace's *Odes*, 118 f.
- Richmond (I. A.) on Ashby's *Aqueducts of Ancient Rome*, 91
- Ridington's *The Minoan-Mycenaean Background of Greek Athletics*, 241
- Roberts (C. H.) on Milne's *Greek Shorthand Manuals* (Syllabary and Commentary), 24
- Robertson (D. S.) on *Memoirs of the American Academy in Rome* (XII), 43. Obituary notice of A. E. Housman, 113
- Robertson (H. G.) *Ἄλκῃ* and *Ἰσχύς* in Aeschylus' *Supplices*, 104
- Robinson's (D. M.) *A Short History of Greece*, 229; his *Pindar, a Poet of Eternal Ideas*, 237
- Robinson's (E. S. G.) *Sylloge Nummorum Graecorum*, vol. I, part ii: 242; vol. II, parts v-vi: 144
- Robinson's (R. P.) *The Germania of Tacitus*, 134
- Rogers, Scott, and Ward's *Caesaris Augusti Res Gestae et Fragmenta*, 38
- Roman roads, direction-posts on, 166
- Rome (H. J.) on Bowra's *Pindari Carmina cum fragmentis*, 14. On Wolters' *Notes on antique Folklore, on the basis of Pliny's Natural History bk. XXVIII* 22-29: 42. On Hooke's *The Labyrinth*, 42. On a Bibliography on the Survival of the Classics (I), 43. On Terzaghi's *Storia della Letteratura latina*, 130. On Pettazzoni's *La Confessione dei Peccati*, 145. On Rutgers' *Rondom Elektra*, 147. On Thierfelder's *Beiträge zur Kritik und Erklärung des Apollonius Dyscolus*, 147. On Elom's *De typische Geitalen bij Homeros en Herodotos* (I), 172. On Blum's *Studies in the Dream-Book of Artemidorus*, 200. On Teske's *Die Homer-Mimesis in den homerischen Hymnen*, 219. On Scott and Ferguson's *Hermetica* (IV), 222. On van der Veer's *Reiniging en Reinheid bij Plato*, 237. On Ridington's *The Minoan-Mycenaean Background of Greek Athletics*, 241
- Ross's *Aristotle's Physics*, 126
- Russell's *Latin Unseen for School Certificate*, 235
- Russell and Heironimus' *The Shorter Latin Poems of Master Henry of Avranches relating to England*, 83
- Rutgers' *Rondom Elektra*, 147
- Salisbury (F. S.) on Parker's *A History of the Roman World* (A.D. 138-337), 194
- Sandbach (F. H.) on Bozzi's *Idali e correnti letterarie nell' Enide*, 88. On Bury's *Sextus Empiricus* (III), 200
- scatebra, 10
- Schädewaldt's *Sophokles und Athen*, 147
- Schulte's *Index Verborum Valerianus*, 89
- Schütze's *Beiträge zum Verständnis der Phainomena Arats*, 88
- Schwartz's *Charakterköpfe aus der antiken Literatur* (Filippi's Italian translation), 237

- Scott and Ferguson's *Hermetica* (IV), 222
- Scullard (H. H.)** on Nap's *Die römische Republik um das J. 225 v. Chr.*: 138. On Liedmeier's *Plutarchus' Biographie van Aemilius Paulus*, 139. On Bethe's *Athenbild und Familiengeschichte bei Römern und Griechen*, 243
- Scullard's *A History of the Roman World from 753 to 146 B.C.*: 78
- sedile, 10
- Seel's *Iustinus: Epitome Historiarum Philippicarum Pompei Trogi*, 38; his *Hirtius*, 133
- Semenov's *The Greek Language in its Evolution*, 183
- Semonides of Amorgos, version from, 210
- Semple (W. H.)** on Duff's *Silius Italicus, Punica*, 75. On Heuvel's *P. Papinii Statii Thebaidos liber primus*, 76. On Fortgens' *P. Papinii Statii de Opheltis funere carmen epicum*, 76. Note on Virgil *Aen.* viii 65: 112. On Levy's *The Invetive in Rufinum of Claudius Claudianus*, 228
- Sheppard (J. T.)** on Flickinger's *The 'Aupria of Sophocles' Antigone*, 198
- Shewan's *Homeric Essays*, 13
- Shipp (G. P.)** 'cock' in Latin, 164
- Sikes' *Lucretius Poet and Philosopher*, 132
- Silius Italicus, birthplace of, 56
- Silverstein's *Visio Sancti Pauli*, 241
- Sinclair (T. A.)** on Allen, Halliday, and Sikes' *The Homeric Hymns*, 217. On Filippi's Italian translation of Schwartz's *Charakterköpfe aus der antiken Literatur*, 237
- Skeat and Visiak's *Milton's Lament for Damon and his other Latin Poems*, 204
- Skutsch (O.)** on Terzaghi's *Lucilio*, 25. On Strzelecki's *De Naeviano Belli Punici Carmina*, 149. Notes on the *Atularia* of Plautus, 213
- Smertenko and Belknap's *Studies in Greek Religion*, 202
- Smiley (M. T.)** on Wendel's *Scholia in Apollonium Rhodium Vetera*, 36
- Smith's (H. R. W.) *Corpus Vasorum Antiquorum*, U.S.A.: University of California (fasc. 1), 242
- Smith (L. F.)** on Gordon's *Epigraphica* (I), 203
- Smith (L. F.), McLean, and Keyes' *Thesaurus Linguae Latinae Epigraphicae* (II, ii), 205
- somnio, 10
- Sörbom's *Variatio sermonis Tacitei*, 73
- Souter (A.)** on Keenan's *The Life and Times of St. Augustine as Revealed in His Letters*, 39. On de Jong's *Apologetiek en Christendom in den Octavius van Minucius Felix*, 39. On Meecham's *The Letter of Aristides*, 88. On Wikström's *In Firmicum Maternum Studia Critica*, 89. On Weiland's *Het Oordeel der Kerkvaders over het Orakel*, 89. On Hatch's *The Greek Manuscripts of the New Testament*, 201. On Smith, McLean, and Keyes' *Thesaurus Linguae Latinae Epigraphicae* (II, ii), 205. On Wytyes' *Der Streit um den Altar der Viktorie*, 240. On van Beek's *Passio Sanctarum Perpetuae et Felicitatis* (I), 241. On Silverstein's *Visio Sancti Pauli*, 241
- Spencer's *Celsus, de Medicina* (I), 27
- Stanford (W. B.)** The quality of *δύς* in words, 109
- Stella's *Hecyra*, 224
- Stevens (F. T.)** Note on 'Ἀλλοπλίας διαλ γυναικός', 162
- Stocks (J. L.)** on Rackham's *Aristotle, The Athenian Constitution, The Eudemian Ethics, On Virtues and Vices*, 22
- Stokoe's *Latin Verbs*, 87
- Stone (C. G.)** on Cobban's *Senate and Provinces*, 78-49 B.C.: 33
- Strohm's *Untersuchungen zur Entwicklungsgeschichte der aristotelischen Meteorologie*, 37
- Strzelecki's *De Naeviano Belli Punici Carmina*, 149
- Stumpo's *Le Origini della Tragedia*, 18
- SUMMARIES OF PERIODICALS, 44, 92, 153, 205, 243
- Symbotae Osloenses* (XIII), 85
- Byrne (R.)** on Purdie's *Latin Verse Inscriptions*, 27. On Lindsay's *The Romans*, 40. On Evelyn's *Agrippina*, 41. On *Africa Romana*, 142. On Hennemann's *Der äussere und innere Stil in Trajans Briefen*, 150
- Symon's *Thanks to Vergil*, 89
- tabularius, 166
- tam magnus, 11
- tantum auri uides, 217
- Tarn (W. W.)** on Kornemann's *Die Alexandergeschichte des Königs Ptolemaios I von Aegypten*, 137. On Kolbe's *Die Weltreichsidee Alexanders des Grossen*, 242
- Tarrant (D.)** on Morrow's *Studies in the Platonic Epistles*, 22. On Galli's *Platone: II Simposio*, 198
- Tate (J.)** Greek for 'atheism', 3. On Tucker's translation of Longinus on *Elevation of Style*, 23. On Gadamer's *Plato und die Dichter*, 147. On de Vogel's *Een Keerpunt in Plato's Denken*, 220
- technopaegnia, 111
- Terzaghi's *Lucilio*, 25; his *Storia della Letteratura latina*, 130
- Teske's *Die Homer-Mimesis in den homerischen Hymnen*, 219
- Theiler's *Das Musengedicht des Horaz*, 203
- Thierfelder's *Beiträge zur Kritik und Erklärung des Apollonius Dyscolus*, 147
- Thucydides, the manuscript A of, 117
- Tierney's *Aristotle and Menander*, 199
- Till's *Die Sprache Catos*, 131
- Tod (M. N.)** on Hanell's *Die Inschriftensammlung des Konstantinos Lasharis*, 39
- Todd (F. A.)** Note on *tantum auri uides*, 217
- Toynbee (J. M. C.)** on Kruse's *Studien zur offiziellen Geltung des Kaiserbildes im römischen Reiche*, 41
- Tozer's *A History of Ancient Geography*, 2nd edn. with notes by Cary, 42
- transliteration from the Greek, 2
- Tredennick (H.)** on Ross's *Aristotle's Physics*, 126
- Tredennick and Armstrong's *Aristotle, Metaphysics (X-XIV), Oeconomica and Magna Moralia*, 36
- Trees and plants in Homer, 97 ff.
- Tucker's translations of Aeschylus, Agamemnon and Prometheus Bound, 16; his Longinus on *Elevation of Style*, 23; his *Across the Centuries*, 36; his translation of Aeschylus, *Persae*, 171
- Untersteiner's *Sofocle: Studio Critico*, 68
- utrinda, 131
- Valentine's *Latin: its Place and Value in Education*, 12
- Valmin's *Die Zeus-Stoa in der Agora von Athen*, 39; his *Rapport préliminaire de l'expédition en Messénie* (1933, 1934), 39
- van Beek's *Passio Sanctarum Perpetuae et Felicitatis* (I), 241
- Van Buren (A. W.)** on Ashby's *The Aqueducts of Ancient Rome*, 34 (cf. 91)
- Van Buren's *Ancient Rome as Revealed by Recent Discoveries*, 190
- van der Valk's *Beiträge zur Nekyia*, 146
- van der Veer's *Reinigen en Reinheid bij Plato*, 237
- Van Gundy's translation of Horace's *Odes*, 225
- vendax, 131
- Vianello's *D. Iunii Iuvenalis Satirae*, 26
- Vince's Demosthenes (II), 175
- Vlachos' *Hellas and Hellenism*, 192
- von Haxthausen, Kemminghausen, and Soyter's *Neugriechische Volkslieder*, 82
- Warmington (E. H.)** on Cary's edition of Tozer's *A History of Ancient Geography*, 42
- Warmington's *Remains of Old Latin*, 44
- Wason (C. R.)** on Hinks' *Greek and Roman Portrait Sculpture*, 91
- Watson's Latin version of *The Hunting of the Snark*, 183
- Webster (T. B. L.)** on Smith's *Corpus Vasorum Antiquorum*, U.S.A.: University of California (fasc. i), 242
- Webster's *An Introduction to Sophocles*, 171
- Weiland's *Het Oordeel der Kerkvaders over het Orakel*, 89
- Wendel's *Scholia in Apollonium Rhodium Vetera*, 36
- Werres' *Die Beteuerungsformeln in der attischen Komödie*, 199
- Wetmore's *Seneca's conception of the Stoic Sage*, 240
- Whittick (G. C.)** on Birley's *Corbridge Roman Station (Corstopitum)*, 40. On Davies' *Roman Mines in Europe*, 143. On Ormsby Gore's *Illustrated Regional Guides to Ancient Monuments* (II), 204
- Wiener Studien (LIII), 49
- Wikström's *In Firmicum Maternum Studia Critica*, 89
- Wilkinson (L. P.)** Note on Virgil *Ecl.* viii 53-9: 120. On Botschuyver's *Scholia in Horatium*, 150. On Theiler's *Das Musengedicht des Horaz*, 203. On Funaioli's *Horaz als Mensch und Dichter*, 239

Wilkinson's *Greek Sculpture*, 186
 Willrich's *Perikles*, 191
 Winnington-Ingram's *Mode in Greek Music*, 184
 Witlox's *Consolatio ad Liviam*, 44
 Wolters' *Notes on antique Folklore, on the basis of Pliny's Natural History* bk. XXVIII 22-29: 42
 Wood (E. J.) on Seel's *Iustinus: Epitoma Historiarum*

Philippicarum Pompei Trogi, 38. On Constans' Bude text of Cicero's Letters (II), 71
 Woodcock (E. C.) on Marouzeau's *Traité de Stylistique appliquée au latin*, 70
 Wytzes' *Der Streit um den Altar der Viktoria*, 240
 Yale *Classical Studies* (IV), 84
 Yorke (E. C.) on Hesiod, *Works and Days* 740: 212

II.—INDEX LOCORUM.

Note:—'passim' means that several passages of the author or work are dealt with at the given page.

Aeschines ii 175: 6; iii 139: 163
 Aeschylus *A.* 1-11: 51 ff.; 14: 60; 447 ff.: 162; 1453 ff.: 162; 1480: 115; 1485 ff.: 163; 1594: 17.
Ch. 563 ff.: 11; 652, 655 ff.: 163; 680: 11. *Eu.* 80: 54; 228: 116; 369: 54. *Pers.* passim: 171; 409: 67; *Pr.* 52: 2; 357, 364: 110. *Supp.* passim: 104 f. *Th.* 233, 903 ff.: 163
 Alcman passim: 169
 Ammianus Marcellinus passim: 150
 Andocides iii 9: 6
Anthologia Palatina vii 472: 167; ix 546: 129; ix 564: 60
 Apollonius Rhodius i 41: 120
 Archilochus *frag.* 748: 120
 Aristophanes *Av.* 38: 117. *Ec.* 884: 124. *Eg.* 1055: 212. *Fr.* 193: 64. *Nu.* 225, 741, 857: 117. *Pl.* 845 ff.: 117. *Ra.* 308: 117. *V.* 715: 6
 Aristotle *EE* passim: 23. *Opusc.* passim: 221 f. *PA* 641b 16: 164. *Ph.* 263a 18 ff.: 174. *Po.* passim: 110. *Rh.* passim: 109 ff.
 Bede *Hist. Eccl.* iii 8: 216
 Caesar *B.C.* i 52: 11
 Cicero *De Div.* i 74, ii 56: 165. *Dom.* 27: 238. *Mur.* 61: 165. *Prov. Cons.* 5: 34. *Epp.* passim: 71 f. *Att.* i 14: 10; viii 11: 11. *Fam.* v 11: 2: 11. *Q.F.* i 12: 11
 C.I.L. passim: 56; I (ii) 638: 166; VI 2343-5: 91
Ciris 416: 11
Codex Theodosianus ix 1 13: 152
 Demetrius *repl' Epimn.* 173: 109
 Demosthenes 600 12: 60; *Or. Priv.* passim: 175 f.
 Diodorus xi 88: 3: 6
 Dionysius *de Comp.* 23: 111
 Eubulus *frag.* 54: 117
 Euripides *Andr.* 1022: 117. *Ba.* 208 f., 908 ff.: 116 f. *El.* 228, 1351: 116. *HF* 754: 66. *Ion* 286: 116. *Or.* 72: 53; 1403: 212. *Ph.* 1181: 67; 1373 ff., 1424: 116. *Tr.* 368: 162; 901, 1176 f.: 116
 Herodotus ii passim: 60 f.; iii 89 ff.: 40; iv 177: 101; vi 125: 54; 129: 173
 Hesiod *Op.* 582, 740: 212
 Homer passim: 97 ff.; *Il.* ii 107: 213; ix 129 f.: 232
 Horace *C.* passim: 119 ff.; i 4: 7: 120; i 6: 1: 118; iii 4: 203
I.G. I² passim: 6 ff.
 Isocrates iv 108: 6
 Josephus *Ant. Ind.* xviii 6: 5: 172: 11
 Juvenal passim: 26 f.; i 155 f.: 122; iii 91: 164; ix 107: 165; xiv 279: 9
 Lucan i 555: 9; v 442 ff., 653 f.: 179
 Lucretius v 1203, vi 88 ff.: 38
 Lysias vi 40: 163

Martial i 12: 10: 11; i 61: 3 f., iv 14: 58; vi 36: 1: 11; xiii 63: 165
 Nonnus xxxviii 196 ff.: 239
 Oppian *Hal.* ii 315: 54; v 6: 212
 Ovid *Ars.* i 429: 44, 157. *Fast.* iv 329 f.: 112. *Met.* vi 55 ff.: 10
Panegyrici Latini passim: 9 f.
 Pausanias i 27: 5: 6
 Petronius 37: 4-7: 217
 Pindar passim: 14 ff. *N.* iii 53: 212; ix 32: 5 f. *P.* ii 16: 212
 Plato *Apol.* passim: 3 ff. *Cra.* 425d, 426b: 111. *Criti.* 119d: 60. *Euthphr.* 3b 3: 3. *Grg.* 458a, 467d, 476b: 60. *Lg.* x passim: 3 ff.; 701b 2: 164. *Mx.* 246e: 116. *Phd.* 66c 7: 163; 113d: 60. *Pit.* 286e 6, 296b 7: 62; 303d: 237. *R.* 331c: 60; 369d: 167; 528a: 60; 562b 8: 164. *Sis.* 391d: 212. *Smp.* 180a, 208d: 117. *Thi.* 157b: 60. *Ti.* 57c: 164
 Plautus *Amph.* 697: 10. *Aul.* passim: 213 f.; 465 f.: 165. *Bacch.* 276: 213. *Men.* 10: 223. *Merc.* 750, 908: 224. *Pers.* 257: 10
 Pliny *N.H.* xxxiii 3: 215 ff.; xxx 113: 55
 Pliny *Epp.* passim: 59; i 4: 1: 58 ff.; x 58: 151
 Plotinus *Enn.* vi passim: 200
 Plutarch *Mor.* 206e, 244d, 375d: 128. *Vit.* passim: 127. *Arist.* 5: 55. *Pers.* 23: 6
Rhetorici Graeci iii 650: 111
 Semonides ap. Stob. *Flor.* 73 61: 210 f.
 Seneca *De Ben.* passim: 133 f.; i 14: 1, iv 39: 2: 121. *Epp.* passim: 11; 79: 4: 121
 Sextus Empiricus passim: 200
 Silius Italicus passim: 56 ff.
 Sophocles *Ant.* 393: 53; 730 f.: 115. *El.* 1304: 116. *OC* 1130: 67
 Statius *Silo.* iv 6: 43: 11; iv 7 and 8: 38; v 1: 112: 11. *Theb.* v 534: 11
 Strabo xv 1: 50: 167
 Tacitus *Agr.* 18: 7: 11. *Ann.* i 77, ii 34, iv 51: 73; xi 36: 3: 11; xv 39: 238. *Dial.* i 2: 11. *Germ.* 37: 1: 11. *Hist.* passim: 181
 Terence *Hec.* 742: 238
 Theocritus i 5, 132 ff.: 120; vii 5: 54; xi 42: 60
 Theopompus *frag.* 225b: 33
 Thucydides passim: 7 f., 60; i 22: 174; ii 44: 1, iv 39, v 14: 117
 Ulpian *Dig.* 47: 10: 5: 213
 Varro *L.L.* vii 91: 10
 Virgil *Aen.* iv passim: 227; vi 57, vii 456 f.: 122; viii 65: 112. *Ecl.* ii 24: 120; viii 53 ff.: 120. *Geo.* l. 171: 120
 Xenophon *An.* iv i 14: 60; vii 8: 25-6: 40. *HG* vi 3: 18 ff.: 231

III.—INDEX OF GREEK WORDS.

ἀγαθεν, ἀγκάσω, 54
 ἄθεος, 5
 ἀκήρατος, 237
 ἀμυδής, 218
 ἀνάκρισις, 232
 ἀποβαίνω, 117
 ἀρμονία, 185
 ἀσάμυθος, 101
 ἀσφοδελός, 101
 ἀτιμία, 8
 αὐτονομία, 8
 ἀφικνεσθαι, 60
 βεννεύειν, 215
 βριαρεύειν, 2

διδά, διαί, 162 ff.
 δίκη, 104 ff.
 δρόν, 98
 εὐλακρινής, 237
 ἐπικληρος, 106
 εὐθυναί, 8
 εὐσεβεῖν, 115
 ἔφεισι, 8, 232
 ἡγείσθαι θεοῦ (εἶναι), 4
 θρόνον, 102
 ἰχώρ, 115
 καθαρός, 237
 κακομήτα, 212
 κίεω, 11

λαβαίνω, 82
 λαβύρινθος, 101
 λακκόπλους, 55
 λάκκος, 55
 λαῖβραι, 55
 λογικός, 23
 λωτός, 101
 μέτοικος, 8; μετοίκιον, 127
 μήκος, 53
 νομίζειν θεοῦ (εἶναι), 3
 ὀβρις, 77
 οὐσύναι βίβας, 99
 ὄψις, 109 ff.
 παθαίνω, 82

πέφτω, 82
 πηθήσκω, 83
 πηδίστας, 215
 σέλιον, 101
 σηνεία μονόβολα, 24
 τεκμορεύσας, 215
 τίθεσθαι, 60
 τόνος, 185
 τυνδάρεος, τυνδαρεύς, 2
 ὑάκινθος, 101
 ὕβρις, 104 ff.
 ὑπερπυράζειν, 117
 φηγός, 98
 φύσις, 77

astana'

Stylis.

o

212

x : ix ;

Met.

f. P.

: III.

458a.

: 164.

: 60.

331c :

Sis.

157b :

13 f. ;

: 223.

51

assim :

2 : 121.

1304 :

I 112 :

51 : 73 ;

erm. 37

: 60

44 I, iv

f. : 122 ;

I. : 120.

HG vi 3

24

veús, 2

17

THE RENDEL HARRIS PAPYRI

of Woodbrooke College, Birmingham

Edited
with Translation and Notes

by

J. ENOCH POWELL

With a portrait and 5 plates

15s. net

**CAMBRIDGE
UNIVERSITY PRESS**

CLASSICAL STUDIES

By J. W. MACKAIL, O.M., LL.D., F.B.A.

Second Impression. 7s. 6d. net.

A collection of lectures and addresses. Some deal with the Classics as an element in the higher life of the individual, the nation and the empire ; while others illustrate the inexhaustible interest of the Greek and Latin masterpieces.

Contents : The Place of Greek and Latin in Human Life—The Report of the Prime Minister's Committee on the Classics in Education—What is the Good of Greek ? —Penelope in the 'Odyssey'—The Alliance of Latin and English Studies—Virgil's Italy—The Virgilian Underworld—The 'Odes' of Horace—The Last Great Roman Historian—The Classics—The Place of the Classics in Imperial Studies—Patriotism.

THE AENEID OF VIRGIL

Translated, with an introductory essay, by FRANK RICHARDS, M.A.

Cheap Edition. 6s. net.

The translation is in blank verse, limited to the number of the Latin lines ; its aim is to be a readable as well as a faithful representation of the original, omitting nothing and adding nothing, avoiding archaism of language and monotony of rhythm. An original and very valuable part of the work is the introduction.

JOHN MURRAY, 50, ALBEMARLE STREET, LONDON, W. 1

P O M P E I I

By R. C. CARRINGTON

Illustrated 10/6 net

'... Mr. Carrington, who has already made valuable contributions to the study of ancient Italian domestic architecture, here brings together the product of current research on Pompeii into convenient compass for the general reader ...'

Architects' Journal

ROMAN BRITAIN AND THE ENGLISH SETTLEMENTS

By R. G. COLLINGWOOD and J. N. L. MYRES

12/6 net

A new volume of the 'Oxford History of England'

AN INTRODUCTION TO SOPHOCLES

By T. B. L. WEBSTER

12/6 net

'... This very able and thoughtful book will hold an honoured place in Sophoclean exegesis ...'—*Manchester Guardian*

A GLOSSARY OF GREEK BIRDS

By D'ARCY W. THOMPSON

Illustrated 12/6 net

The second edition, revised, enlarged and improved, of a book which has been, for scholars, a useful work of reference for more than forty years

OXFORD UNIVERSITY PRESS

